

SOURCE AND REVISION IN THE NARRATIVES OF DAVID'S TRANSFER OF THE ARK

Text, Language and Story

in 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16

VOLUME I

ROBERT REZETKO

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

**UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
THE SCHOOL OF DIVINITY, NEW COLLEGE
HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES**

2004



Pursuant to section 3.8.7 of the
Postgraduate Study Regulations,
the writer declares

- (a) that this thesis has been composed by the candidate, and
- (b) that the work is the candidate's own, and
- (c) that the work has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Robert C. Rezetko

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to evaluate the relationship between Samuel and Chronicles in a single synoptic story: David's transfer of Israel's sacred ark to Jerusalem in 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. Chapter one surveys areas of research related to Samuel and Chronicles. First, the writer summarises research and perspectives on these books and their stories of David's ark transfer. The review highlights competing approaches to Samuel which centre on either sources or composition and on either a diachronic or synchronic methodology. The literary history of Samuel is inadequate in conventional perspective, and must be freshly unfolded, and consequently the relationship of Samuel and Chronicles must also be re-evaluated. Second, the writer reviews the textual evidence for both books, focusing on the received versions, the Greek translations, and in the case of Samuel, on the Dead Sea Scrolls. The witnesses to Chronicles are relatively uniform, and it is suggested that the pluriformity among witnesses to Samuel, and the character of the MT of this book, are related to Samuel's editorial history. In particular, revisers reshaped the story of David's ark transfer in Chronicles *and* Samuel. Chapter two surveys issues related to synchronic and diachronic approaches to Samuel and Chronicles. The writer suggests that the impasse between these competing approaches may be resolved by the textual-exegetical approach, that is, by using text-critical controls on redactional arguments. The versional evidence substantiates the validity of the diachronic approach—*there are* earlier and later forms of biblical texts and editions of biblical stories—and scholars can use this evidence to discern literary origins and developments—developments in the versions whose special features, and the reasons for them, may be perceived and appreciated through holistic or final-form readings. Related to this, the writer points out that the issues of text, language (grammar, vocabulary, style) and story are interconnected. Textual variation and grammatical and stylistic incongruities and lexical discrepancies frequently signal editorial developments in biblical compositions. Three helpful models for understanding this developmental process are considered: McKane's rolling corpus, Tov's and Ulrich's literary layers, and Fishbane's inner-biblical exegesis. Finally, it is stated that the principal text-critical aim in this thesis is the detection of earlier and later forms of biblical texts or stories, or to state it differently, the discovery of earlier and later stages in their editorial histories. Using the aforementioned insights and methodologies, chapters three through six closely examine 2 Samuel 6 and the synoptic portions of 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. The latter has one short and two lengthy pluses (13.1-4; 15.1-24; 16.4-42) but the text and story in its synoptic material are more primitive than in synoptic MT Samuel. 2 Samuel 6 has one short plus (vv. 20b-23) but the text and story in its synoptic material have developed in MT Samuel beyond LXX Samuel and beyond synoptic Chronicles. In other words, 2 Samuel 6 is a shorter version on the whole, yet in many particulars the MT is a later version of the story of David's ark transfer. The text's 'poor condition' is evidence of its editorial history. Overall, 2 Samuel 6 shows greater textual variation and fluidity, more doublets, and more interpretative difficulties than does 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. Specifically, the MT reflects much literary creativity and ideological bias. The readings special to this text relate to an apology of Davidic kingship, an apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character, and cultic practice. In addition, many textual manipulations in MT 2 Samuel 6 connect to the language of stories in 1 Samuel, especially chapters 2, 10-15, 17 and 25. All these interconnected adjustments point to successive editorial interventions over a substantial period of time and their cumulative appearance and objective may be labelled a literary layer. The thesis concludes with observations regarding the implications of the present investigation for the theories of A. G. Auld.

PREFACE

I am grateful for excellent supervision and needed support during my years of post-graduate studies. It is fitting to acknowledge my indebtedness and gratitude to the following teachers, friends and family.

First and foremost, I thank Professor A. Graeme Auld, my supervisor, who never ceased to provide judicious criticism of my research and stimulate my mind during my period of studies at the University of Edinburgh (1999-2004). I will never be able to thank him adequately for all he has taught me. I also thank my second supervisor, Dr. Timothy H. Lim, for his constant support and model of scholarship. I am also grateful for several helpful conversations with Dr. David J. Reimer.

Education is a cumulative process and therefore I wish to recognise others who enabled me to arrive at this point in my scholastic pursuits. At the University of Arizona (1987-1991, 1997-1998), I thank Dr. Thomas D. Worthen, emeritus (Department of Classics); Ms. Shoshana Green (Department of Judaic Studies); and Dr. Beth A. Nakhai and Professor William G. Dever, emeritus (Department of Near Eastern Studies). At Dallas Theological Seminary (1991-1996), I thank Professor Buist M. Fanning, III, and Professor Daniel B. Wallace (Department of New Testament Studies); and Professor Robert B. Chisholm, Jr., and Professor Richard A. Taylor (Department of Old Testament Studies). At Brandeis University (1998-1999), I thank Professor Marc Z. Brettler and Dr. David P. Wright (Department of Near Eastern and Judaic Studies).

Several others have given me helpful comments on these and/or related investigations. At Trinity International University, I thank Professor K. Lawson Younger, Jr., and Professor Richard E. Averbeck (Department of Old Testament and Semitic Languages). Professor Averbeck taught me when he was at Dallas Theological Seminary.

At the University of Sheffield, I thank Dr. Diana V. Edelman (Department of Biblical Studies). At Ohio Northern University, I thank Professor Raymond F. Person, Jr. (Department of Philosophy and Religion). At the University of Sydney, I thank Dr. Ian M. Young (Department of Hebrew, Biblical, and Jewish Studies).

To all the above, I say a big thank you! Of course, I am responsible for the contents of this thesis. Any errors are mine alone.

Several friends have proven to be strong pillars of support. I thank especially Enrique Kringe, Joe Fantin, Robert Lane and Alan Lenzi. Also, Brian and Pam Aucker helped our family in many ways when we relocated to Edinburgh.

To my parents Ron and Virginia, my step-mother Carole, and my sister Laura, what more can I say: I've finally finished formal schooling! I'm grateful you never gave up hope.

Finally, but not least, my wife has endured living with a 'professional student' for the entirety of our marriage. Perhaps only those who have accompanied a spouse through post-graduate studies can really grasp the depth of her endurance. She has supported me with patience and sacrifice beyond measure. Mirna, thank you! My children, Daniel, Gabriela, Talya and Camila, have waited, and waited still more, for 'papi' to finish 'his book'. Kids, it's done!

Robert Rezetko

Guadalajara, Mexico

February, 2004

para mi esposa e hijos

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
-----------------	----------

PREFACE	ii-iv
----------------	--------------

TABLE OF CONTENTS	v-xiv
--------------------------	--------------

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv-xvi
------------------------------	---------------

INTRODUCTION	1-2
---------------------	------------

CHAPTER ONE	
CONTEXTS: BOOKS, STORIES, VERSIONS	3-36

1.0	Introduction	3
1.1	Samuel and Chronicles	3-10
1.2	David's Transfer of the Ark	10-22
1.2.1	Introduction	10-12
1.2.2	David's Transfer of the Ark in Samuel	13-19
1.2.3	David's Transfer of the Ark in Chronicles	19-22
1.3	Versions of Samuel and Chronicles	23-34
1.3.1	Introduction	23-26
1.3.2	Versions of Samuel	26-32
1.3.3	Versions of Chronicles	32-34
1.4	Summary of Chapter One	34-36

CHAPTER TWO		
APPROACHES: SYNCHRONIC, DIACHRONIC, TEXTUAL-EXEGETICAL		37-65
2.0	Introduction	37
2.1	Synchronic Approach: Reading Stories about David and Saul in a Biblical Context	37-43
2.2	Diachronic Approach: Discerning Literary Layers in Stories about David and Saul	44-45
2.3	Textual-Exegetical Approach: Combining Textual and Literary Criticism in an Analysis of Stories about David and Saul	46-64
2.3.1	Rise, Decline, Rebirth	46-48
2.3.2	Concepts and Methodology	48-64
2.3.2.1	From Pluriformity to Uniformity	48-52
2.3.2.2	Concept of a Rolling Corpus	53-54
2.3.2.3	Concept of Literary Layers	54-55
2.3.2.4	Concept of Inner-Biblical Exegesis	56-59
2.3.2.5	Principles of Textual Criticism	60-63
2.3.2.6	Issues of Dating	63
2.3.2.7	Tools for Grammatical and Lexical Analysis	63-64
2.4	Summary of Chapter Two	64-65

CHAPTER THREE		
ANALYSIS OF 2 SAMUEL 6.1-5 AND 1 CHRONICLES 13.5-8		66-98

3.0	Introduction	66-67
3.1	Analysis	67-97
3.1.1	The Story's Context and Occasion	67-71
3.1.1.1	The Literary Context	67-68

3.1.1.2	2 Sam. 6.1 1 Chron. 13.5	ויסף עוד דוד ויקהל דויד	68-70
3.1.1.3	2 Sam. 6.2 1 Chron. 13.6 1 Chron. 13.5	ויקם וילך דוד ... להעלות משם ויעל דויד ... להעלות משם להביא	70-71
3.1.2	The Story's Geography		72-78
3.1.2.1	The Procession's Origin		72
3.1.2.2	2 Sam. 6.2 1 Chron. 13.6 1 Chron. 13.5	מבעלי יהודה // בעלתה אל קרית יערים אשר ליהודה מקרית יערים	72-74
3.1.2.3	2 Sam. 6.3 2 Sam. 6.3, 4 1 Chron. 13.7	וירכבו ... אל-עגלה חדשה ... וישאהו מבית אבינדב אשר בגבעה וירכיבו ... על-עגלה חדשה מבית אבינדב	74-78
3.1.3	The Participants' Identity and Number		78-84
3.1.3.1	2 Sam. 6.1 1 Chron. 13.5	את-כל-בחור בישראל // את-כל-ישראל	79
3.1.3.2	2 Sam. 6.1 1 Chron. 13.5	שלשים אלף // מן-שיחור מצרים ועד-לבוא חמת	80-82
3.1.3.3	2 Sam. 6.2 1 Chron. 13.6	וכל-העם אשר אתו // וכל-ישראל	82-83
3.1.3.4	2 Sam. 6.5 1 Chron. 13.8	ודוד וכל-בית ישראל // ודויד וכל-ישראל	83-84
3.1.4	The Participants' Performance		84-89
3.1.4.1	2 Sam. 6.5 1 Chron. 13.8	משחקים לפני יהוה // משחקים לפני האלהים	85-86
3.1.4.2	2 Sam. 6.5 1 Chron. 13.8	בכל עצי ברושים // בכל-עז ובשרים	86-88
3.1.4.3	2 Sam. 6.5 1 Chron. 13.8	ובכורות ובנבלים ובתפים ובמנענעים ובצלצלים // ובכורות ובנבלים ובתפים ובמצלתים ובחצצרות	88-89
3.1.5	The Attendants' Identity and Position		90-94
3.1.5.1	2 Sam. 6.3 1 Chron. 13.7	ועזא ואחזי בני אבינדב // ועזא ואחזי	90-91

3.1.5.2	2 Sam. 6.3 1 Chron. 13.7 2 Sam. 6.4 2 Sam. 6.7 1 Chron. 13.10	ועזא ואחיו נהגים אתהעגלה חדשה // ועזא ואחיו נהגים בעגלה ואחיו הלך לפני הארון עם ארון האלהים // לפני אלהים	91-94
3.1.6	The Ark's Epithets		94-97
3.1.6.1	1 Chron. 13.5 2 Sam. 6.3 1 Chron. 13.7 2 Sam. 6.4 2 Sam. 6.4	אתהארון האלהים אתהארון האלהים // אתהארון האלהים עם ארון האלהים הארון	94
3.1.6.2	2 Sam. 6.2 1 Chron. 13.6	את ארון האלהים אשרנקרא שם שם יהוה צבאות יושב הכרובים עליו // ארון האלוהים יהוה יושב הכרובים אשרנקרא שם	94-97
3.2	Summary of Chapter Three		97-98
CHAPTER FOUR			
	ANALYSIS OF 2 SAMUEL 6.6-10 AND 1 CHRONICLES 13.9-13		99-144
4.0	Introduction		99
4.1	Analysis		100-142
4.1.1	Uzzah's Error		100-109
4.1.1.1	2 Sam. 6.6 1 Chron. 13.9	ויבאו עדיגרן נכון // ויבאו עדיגרן כידן	100-105
4.1.1.2	2 Sam. 6.6 1 Chron. 13.9	וישלח עזא אל־ארון האלהים ויאחז בו // וישלח עזא את־ידו לאחז אתהארון	105-108
4.1.1.3	2 Sam. 6.6 1 Chron. 13.9	כי שמטו הבקר	108-109
4.1.2	Yahweh's Response: Anger and Execution		109-126
4.1.2.1	2 Sam. 6.7 1 Chron. 13.10	ויחר־אף יהוה בעזה/א	109-110
4.1.2.2	2 Sam. 6.7 1 Chron. 13.10	ויכהו שם האלהים עליהשל // ויכהו על אשר־שלח ידו עליהארון	111-125
4.1.2.3	2 Sam. 6.7 1 Chron. 13.10	וימת שם עם ארון האלהים // וימת שם לפני אלהים	125-126

4.1.3	David's Response: Anger, Fear and Rejection	126-142
4.1.3.1	2 Sam. 6.8 1 Chron. 13.11	וַיַּחַר לְדָוִד עַל אֲשֶׁר פָּרִץ יְהוָה פָּרִץ בְּעֹזָה // וַיַּחַר לְדָוִיד כִּי פָרִץ יְהוָה פָּרִץ בְּעֹזָה
4.1.3.2	2 Sam. 6.8 1 Chron. 13.11	וַיִּקְרָא לַמָּקוֹם הַהוּא פָּרִץ עֹזָה/א עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה
4.1.3.3	2 Sam. 6.9 1 Chron. 13.12	וַיִּירָא דָוִד אֶת־יְהוָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא // וַיִּירָא דָוִד אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא
4.1.3.4	2 Sam. 6.9 1 Chron. 13.12	וַיֹּאמֶר אֵיךְ יָבוֹא אֵלַי אֲרוֹן יְהוָה // לֵאמֹר הֵיךְ אָבִיָּא אֵלַי אֶת אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים
4.1.3.5	2 Sam. 6.10 1 Chron. 13.13	וּלְאַחַבָּה דָוִד לְחַסֵּיךְ אֵלָיו אֶת־אֲרוֹן יְהוָה עַל־עֵיר דָוִד // וּלְאַחַסֵּיךְ דָוִד אֶת־הָאֲרוֹן אֵלָיו אֶל־עֵיר דָוִד
4.1.3.6	2 Sam. 6.10 1 Chron. 13.13	וַיִּטְהֹר דָוִד בֵּית עֲבֹד־אָדָם הַגָּתִי // וַיִּטְהֹר אֶל־בֵּית עֲבֹד־אָדָם הַגָּתִי
4.2	Summary of Chapter Four	142-144

CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS OF 2 SAMUEL 6.11-15, 17-20A AND 1 CHRONICLES 13.14; 15.25-28; 16.1-3, 43	145-227
--	----------------

5.0	Introduction	145-148
5.1	Analysis	148-224
5.1.1	Yahweh's Response to David's Rejection: Blessing	148-163
5.1.1.1	2 Sam. 6.11 1 Chron. 13.14	וַיֹּשֶׁב אֲרוֹן יְהוָה בֵּית עֲבֹד אָדָם הַגָּתִי שְׁלֹשָׁה חֳדָשִׁים // וַיֹּשֶׁב אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים עַם־בֵּית עֲבֹד אָדָם בְּבֵיתוֹ שְׁלֹשָׁה חֳדָשִׁים
5.1.1.2	2 Sam. 6.11 1 Chron. 13.14	וַיְבָרֶךְ יְהוָה אֶת־עֲבֹד אָדָם וְאֶת־כָּל־בֵּיתוֹ // וַיְבָרֶךְ יְהוָה אֶת־בֵּית עֲבֹד־אָדָם וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לּוֹ
5.1.1.3	2 Sam. 6.12	וַיַּגֵּד לַמֶּלֶךְ דָוִד לֵאמֹר בָּרַךְ יְהוָה אֶת־בֵּית עֲבֹד אָדָם וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לּוֹ בַּעֲבוּר אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים
5.1.2	David's Response to Yahweh's Blessing: The Successful Removal of the Ark to Jerusalem	164-175
5.1.2.1	2 Sam. 6.12 1 Chron. 15.25	וַיֵּלֶךְ דָוִד וַיַּעַל אֶת־אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים מִבֵּית עֲבֹד אָדָם עֵיר דָוִד // וַיְהִי דָוִד וּזְקֵנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּשְׂרֵי הָאֲלָפִים הַהֹלְכִים לְהַעֲלוֹת אֶת־אֲרוֹן בְּרִית־יְהוָה מִן־בֵּית עֲבֹד־אָדָם

5.1.2.2	2 Sam. 6.15 1 Chron. 15.28	ודוד וכל־בית ישראל מעלים את־ארון יהוה // וכל־ישראל מעלים את־ארון ברית־יהוה	166-167
5.1.2.3	2 Sam. 6.17 1 Chron. 16.1	ויבאו את־ארון יהוה ויצגו אתו במקומו בתוך האהל אשר נטה־לו דוד // ויביאו את־ארון האלהים ויצגו אתו בתוך האהל אשר נטה־לו דוד	167-174
5.1.2.4	2 Sam. 6.19-20 1 Chron. 16.43	וילך כל־העם איש לביתו וישב דוד // וילכו כל־העם איש לביתו ויכב דוד	174-175
5.1.3	The Attendant Circumstances of the Ark's Transfer		175-224
5.1.3.1	2 Sam. 6.12 1 Chron. 15.25	בשמחה	175
5.1.3.2	2 Sam. 6.15 1 Chron. 15.28	בתרועה ובקול שופר // בתרועה ובקול שופר ובחצצרות ובמצלות משמעים בנבלים וכנורות	176-177
5.1.3.3	2 Sam. 6.13 1 Chron. 15.26	ויהי כי צעדו נשאי ארון־יהוה ששה צעדים // ויהי בעזר האלהים את־הלויים נשאי ארון ברית־יהוה	177-185
5.1.3.4	2 Sam. 6.13 1 Chron. 15.26	ויזבח שור ומריא // ויזבחו שבעה־פרים ושבעה אילים	185-189
5.1.3.5	2 Sam. 6.17 1 Chron. 16.1 2 Sam. 6.18 1 Chron. 16.2	ויעל דוד עלות לפני יהוה ושלמים // ויקריבו עלות ושלמים לפני האלהים ויכל דוד מהעלות העולה והשלמים // ויכל דוד מהעלות העלה והשלמים	189-202
5.1.3.6	2 Sam. 6.14 1 Chron. 15.27	ודוד מכרכר בכל־עז לפני יהוה // ודוד מכרכר במעיל בוג' וכל־הלויים הנשאים את־הארון והמשררים וכנניה השר המשא המשררים	202-208
5.1.3.7	2 Sam. 6.14 1 Chron. 15.27	ודוד חגור אפוד בד // ועל־דוד אפוד בד	208-213
5.1.3.8	2 Sam. 6.19 1 Chron. 16.3	ויחלק כל־העם לכל־המון ישראל למאיש ועד־אשה לאיש חלת לחם אחת ואשפר אחד ואשישה אחת // ויחלק כל־איש ישראל מאיש ועד־אשה לאיש ככר־לחם ואשפר ואשישה	214-221
5.1.3.9	2 Sam. 6.18 1 Chron. 16.2	ויברך את־העם בשם יהוה צבאות // ויברך את־העם בשם יהוה	221-222
5.1.3.10	2 Sam. 6.20 1 Chron. 16.43	לברך את־ביתו	223-224
5.2	Summary of Chapter Five		224-227

CHAPTER SIX		
ANALYSIS OF 2 SAMUEL 6.16, 20B-23 AND 1 CHRONICLES 15.29		228-286
6.0	Introduction	228-230
6.1	Analysis	230-284
6.1.1	Textual Analysis	230-272
6.1.1.1	The Narrator's Report of Michal's Response to David	230-239
6.1.1.1.1	2 Sam. 6.16 1 Chron. 15.29	והיה ארון יהוה בא עיר דוד ויהי ארון ברית יהוה בא עד־עיר דוד 230-232
6.1.1.1.2	2 Sam. 6.16 1 Chron. 15.29	ומיכל בת־שאול נשקפה בעד החלון 232-234
6.1.1.1.3	2 Sam. 6.16 1 Chron. 15.29	והרא אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד מַפְּזוּ וּמַכְרַח לִפְנֵי יְהוָה והרא אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד מְרַקֵּד וּמִשְׁחָק 234-237
6.1.1.1.4	2 Sam. 6.16 1 Chron. 15.29	והבו לוֹ בַּלְבָּה 237-239
6.1.1.2	Michal's Words to David	239-247
6.1.1.2.1	2 Sam. 6.20b	והצא מיכל בת־שאול לקראת דוד 239-240
6.1.1.2.2	2 Sam. 6.20b	והאמר מה־נִכְבַּד הַיּוֹם מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל 240-241
6.1.1.2.3	2 Sam. 6.20b	אֲשֶׁר נָגְלָה הַיּוֹם לְעֵינַי אֲמָהוּת עַבְדֵּי כְהִגְלוֹת נָגְלוֹת אֶחָד הָרָקִים 241-247
6.1.1.3	David's Words to Michal	247-266
6.1.1.3.1	2 Sam. 6.21	וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל־מִיכָל 248-249
6.1.1.3.2	2 Sam. 6.21	לִפְנֵי יְהוָה 249-251
6.1.1.3.3	2 Sam. 6.21	אֲשֶׁר בַּחֲרִיבִי מֵאֲבִיךָ וּמִכְלִיבִיתוֹ לָצוֹת אֵיךְ נָגִיד עַל־עַם יְהוָה עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל 252-257
6.1.1.3.4	2 Sam. 6.21	וּשְׁחַקְתִּי לִפְנֵי יְהוָה 257-260
6.1.1.3.5	2 Sam. 6.22	וְנִקְלַתִּי עוֹד מִזֹּאת 261-262
6.1.1.3.6	2 Sam. 6.22	וְהִיִּיתִי שָׁפֵל בְּעֵינַי 262-264
6.1.1.3.7	2 Sam. 6.22	וְעַם־הָאֲמָהוּת אֲשֶׁר אָמַרְתָּ עַמָּם אֲכַבְדָּהּ 264-266

2.2	Summary of Synoptic Usage in Samuel–Kings and Chronicles	338-347
2.2.1	Same Term(s) in Parallel Texts	338-342
2.2.2	יהוה in Samuel–Kings // אלהים in Chronicles	342-343
2.2.3	אלהים in Samuel–Kings // יהוה in Chronicles	344
2.2.4	Minus in Chronicles	344-345
2.2.5	Minus in Samuel–Kings	346-347
2.2.6	Other Substitutions	347
2.3	A Bird's Eye View of יהוה and אלהים 'Minuses' in Samuel–Kings and Chronicles	347-351
2.4	Commentary on Variation Related to Absolute Uses of יהוה and אלהים in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16	351-357
2.5	In the Presence of the Deity	358-362
2.6	Commentary on Variation Related to לפני יהוה and לפני האלהים and Other Phrases in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16	362-371
2.7	The Epithets of the Ark	372-392
2.8	Commentary on Variation Related to ארון יהוה and ארון האלהים and Other Phrases in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16	392-402
APPENDIX THREE HISTORICAL HEBREW GRAMMAR		403-449
3.1	Introduction	403
3.2	Features Discussed Elsewhere	403
3.3	Agreement	403-404
3.4	Word Order	404-412
3.5	Conjunction	412-413
3.6	Preposition	413-426
3.7	Verb	426-427
3.8	Spelling	427-429

3.9	Vocabulary	429-448
3.10	Conclusion	449

APPENDIX FOUR		
TABLE OF SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES		450-453
IN 1 SAMUEL 4.1B-7.2 AND 2 SAMUEL 5.17-6.23		

APPENDIX FIVE		
ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION OF SAUL IN A BIBLICAL CONTEXT		454-462

4.1	Saul and Absalom, in 1 Samuel 16–31 and 2 Samuel 13–20	454-458
4.2	Saul and Samson, in 1 Samuel 16–31 and Judges 13–16	458-462

APPENDIX SIX		
SYNOPTIC VERSIONS OF 2 SAMUEL 6 // 1 CHRONICLES 13, 15–16		463-499

5.1	Chapter Three: Hebrew and Greek Versions of 2 Samuel 6.1-5 // 1 Chronicles 13.5-8	464-470
5.2	Chapter Four: Hebrew and Greek Versions of 2 Samuel 6.6-10 // 1 Chronicles 13.9-13	471-477
5.3	Chapter Five: Hebrew and Greek Versions of 2 Samuel 6.11-15, 17-20a // 1 Chronicles 13.14; 15.25-28; 16.1-3, 43	478-491
5.4	Chapter Six: Hebrew and Greek Versions of 2 Samuel 6.16 // 1 Chronicles 15.29 and 2 Samuel 6.20b-23	492-499

APPENDIX SEVEN		
PUBLISHED HISTORICAL GRAMMAR ESSAY		500-536

BIBLIOGRAPHY		537-606
---------------------	--	----------------

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BDB

- 1907 *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs (eds.) (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

BHS

- 1990 *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; 4th revised edn.).

CAD

- 1956– *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago: Oriental Institute).

DBHE

- 1994 *Diccionario bíblico hebreo-español*, L. Alonso Schökel, V. Morla and V. Collado (eds.) (Madrid: Editorial Trotta).

DCH

- 1993– *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, D. J. A. Clines (ed.) (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

GKC

- 1910 *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, E. Kautzsch (ed.), A. E. Cowley (rev. and trans.) (Oxford: Clarendon Press; 2nd edn., rev. in accordance with the 28th German edition [1909]).

HALOT

- 1994 *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner et al. (eds.) (5 vols.; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994-2000).

JM

- 1991 *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, P. Joüon and T. Muraoka (2 vols.; Subsidia Biblica, 14; Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico).

TDOT

- 1974– *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren and H.-J. Gabry (eds.) (13 vols., א through קי; trans. J. T. Willis, D. E. Green, G. W. Bromiley and D. W. Stott; Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974-2004). Translation of *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (7 vols.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1970-1995).

WO

- 1990 *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

INTRODUCTION

Chapters one and two discuss the investigative context and methodological approach of this thesis. Therefore, the brief introductory remarks to follow deal only with the genesis and objective of this study.

My interest in the literary artistry of biblical stories originally surfaced while investigating the reconstruction of Israelite history in the Late Bronze and Iron ages by employing both written and artifactual evidence. W. G. Dever's insistence on correlating 'text and tell' initially influenced me to approach Israelite history this way. Paradoxically, in my first related writing project, I argued that historians and archaeologists regularly misuse biblical literature in their discussions of the emergence of Israel in Canaan. My criticisms addressed their markedly straight-forward readings in which they stop short of grasping the literary artistry in biblical historiography. I argued, under the influence of M. Z. Brettler and K. L. Younger, that the proper use of biblical stories in the exploration of Israelite history should involve a new-literary- or narrative-critical investigation of biblical stories and a comparative-literary contextualization of those stories in their ancient context. I have further explored this methodology in writing projects on Canaanite (Amarna), Ugaritic and Hittite history. The present writing project takes an additional step backwards in the investigative process as I originally envisioned it: the unfolding of Israelite history based on the twin-foundation of 'text and tell' can occur only after appraising the literary artistry of biblical stories, and that appraisal should incorporate a critical examination of the biblical texts which convey those stories. The heart of this thesis is textual and literary criticism, and my approach is indebted to the supervision of A. G. Auld, and to his writings as well as those of J. C. Treballe Barrera.

This thesis investigates the synoptic presentations of David's relocation of Israel's sacred ark to Jerusalem in 2 Samuel 6 and in 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. For more than two centuries scholars have supposed that the Chronicler rewrote the story in the Former Prophets, and consequently the differences between the accounts in language and content are assumed to be the Chronicler's. In addition, since scholars consider Chronicles to be secondary to Samuel on a literary basis, they also consider the later book to be generally inferior to the earlier one in historical particulars. Since the discovery slightly more than a half-century ago of 4QSam^a, scholars have gradually recognised that not every difference between the synoptic presentations is due to the Chronicler's initiative or *Tendenz*. Additionally, scholars' confidence in the Chronicler's historical reliability has increased somewhat while at the same time their confidence in the Deuteronomist's dependability has gradually waned.¹ This thesis seeks to advance still further this appraisal of Samuel–Kings vis-à-vis Chronicles by arguing that MT Samuel's portrayal of David's transfer of the ark shows much late literary creativity and ideological bias.

¹ See Peltonen 1996: II, 754–795.

CHAPTER ONE

Contexts: Books, Stories, Versions

1.0 Introduction

This chapter surveys three areas of research related to Samuel and Chronicles: (1) the history of research and current views on the composition of these books; (2) the history of research on the story of David's transfer of the ark in Samuel and Chronicles, and the meaning of each narrative in its context; and (3) the history of research on the textual witnesses to Samuel and Chronicles, focusing on the received versions, the Greek translations, and in the case of Samuel, on the Dead Sea Scrolls. This survey establishes the context for the investigation as a whole.

1.1 Samuel and Chronicles

The relationship between Samuel–Kings and Chronicles is extraordinarily complex. Synoptic material makes up forty percent of Chronicles² but only five percent of Samuel and fifteen percent of Kings.³ Notable large-scale differences between these books are David's preparations for the temple in 1 Chronicles 15–16, 22–29, the absence in Chronicles of Samuel's histories of Saul and personal life of David, and the absence in Chronicles of Kings' history of northern monarchs. In addition to these and other large

² This percentage is true for portions of Chronicles which are parallel to Samuel–Kings and for portions of Chronicles as a whole which are parallel to these books as well as Genesis–Exodus, Numbers, Joshua–Judges, Isaiah–Jeremiah, Psalms, Ruth, Ezra–Nehemiah.

³ Verheij 1990: 31; cf. Johnstone 1998: 91 n. 3; Polzin 1976: 27–28.

and small pluses and minuses, the wording and placement of the synoptic material often vary.⁴

Chronicles summarises the period from Adam to David (1 Chronicles 1–9), and deals with David's reign (1 Chronicles 10–29), Solomon's reign (2 Chronicles 1–9), and the kings of Judah, ending with Cyrus, king of Persia (2 Chronicles 10–36).⁵ Many agree that the book's presentation of Israel's history appeals to the post-exilic community⁶ to submit to theocratic rule through a Davidic king over a unified Israel. This standpoint accounts for many recurrent themes such as (1) the temple and its personnel (Levites, priests, singers), the law, and the prophets; (2) the Davidic covenant and dynasty; (3) the focus on Judah and the supremacy of Jerusalem, and the corresponding antipathy for the northern kingdom; and (4) the disposition of the heart, personal piety, repentance, and divine favour and retribution.

Since de Wette's *Historisch-Kritische Untersuchung über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Bücher der Chronik* (1806), research on Chronicles has focused on the credibility of the writer⁷ and his historical reliability.⁸ These issues are linked in turn to endeavours to delineate (1) the writer's sources and (2) the manner in which he used them.⁹

⁴ See the commentaries and layouts in synopses: Hebrew: Bendavid 1972; Kegler and Augustin 1991; Vannutelli 1931; English: Endres, Millar and Burns 1998; Newsome 1986; also Crockett 1897; Mosiman 1907; Wood 1896. Klein 2001 summarises 'additions', 'omissions' and 'changes' in Chronicles.

⁵ It is unnecessary to discuss further the contents and structure of the book, and other issues such as: the book's name and place in the Hebrew canon; the book's extent and unity; the book's author(s), setting, audience and date; and the book's language, style and genres (especially lists and speeches). See, e.g., Japhet 1999; Jones 1993; Klein 1992; Kleinig 1994.

⁶ Most think this community is situated in Jerusalem in the fourth century BCE. But see appendix 3.

⁷ The word 'writer', rather than another term or 'writers' in the plural, is used loosely. Many now hold that the book was written by a single individual, i.e., Chronicles is a unified composition. 1 Chronicles 1–9, 15–16, 23–27 are disputed.

⁸ Graham 1990: 9–34; Peltonen 1996: I, 69–82; Rogerson 1985: 29–33; 1992: 55–57; cf. Japhet 1985.

⁹ Japhet 1993: 14–23, 28–30; Myers 1965: xlv–lxiii; Noth 1987: 11–26 (Williamson's introductory remarks); Williamson 1982: 17–23; also C. D. Bowman 1997: 4–36; Macy 1975: 1–27; esp. Peltonen 1999; earlier Brunet 1953, 1954.

First, what sources did the Chronicler use? The consensus regarding the writer's main sources is that they were the books of Genesis–Exodus, Numbers, Joshua–Kings, Psalms, Ruth, and Ezra–Nehemiah. Furthermore, he had these books in very similar though not identical (see 1.3.3) forms to the ones in our Hebrew Bible. In addition to these primary sources, he probably also had an unknown number of cited and non-cited extra-biblical sources. This thesis does not directly argue for or against the view that Chronicles is based mainly on Samuel–Kings, although the results of the analysis converge with the view that Chronicles and Samuel–Kings depend on a common or shared source.¹⁰ Rather, this thesis shows that the story of David's transfer of the ark in Chronicles is based on a more primitive textform than the one reflected in MT Samuel. In turn, this fact suggests that scholars may not yet have fully appreciated the literary history of Chronicles.

Second, how did the Chronicler use his sources? Scholars label the Chronicler an author, historian or historiographer, theologian, commentator or expositor, interpreter or exegete, and targumist and midrashist.¹¹ The consensus is that the writer did not desire to

¹⁰ This was the standard view prior to de Wette who argued, against Eichhorn 1780 and others, that Chronicles' *Vorlage* was Samuel–Kings. Many subsequently abandoned the notion of a common source, with rare exceptions such as Hävernick 1836; S. Davidson 1856; Zöckler 1874 = Zöckler 1876; Rupprecht 1898; and especially Keil 1833, 1859 and Keil and Delitzsch 1866, 1872. More recently, some argue, or are sympathetic toward the view, that the writers of Samuel and Kings and the writer of Chronicles relied partly or wholly on a common source: Rothstein and Hänel 1927; Goettsberger 1939; van den Bussche 1948; Rehm 1949a; E. J. Young 1949; Mayer 1965; Zawiszeński 1968; Harrison 1969; Macy 1975; Halpern 1981; Friedman 1987; Payne 1988; Rainey 1997; Edelman 2000. The view is argued in Ho 1994, 1995, and by Auld, whose view surfaced in Auld 1983. Prior to Auld 1994, his arguments appeared in Auld 1992, 1993. He has advanced his thesis in many essays now collected in Auld 2004a and in a short commentary on Samuel (Auld 2003). His thesis has garnered some support, but many criticise Auld on methodological, socio-historical, linguistic and literary bases. Regarding the latter, many disagree over (1) the suitability of a shared story beginning with the death of Saul (1 Samuel 31 // 1 Chronicles 10); (2) the motivation for the exilic or post-exilic writer of Kings to include so much material about the northern kingdom; and (3) the writer's supposed awareness of non-synoptic material in Samuel–Kings. The third issue is weighty, and an investigation of all (supposed) cross-references in Chronicles to material in Samuel–Kings is a desideratum. One instance of this phenomenon, Michal in 1 Chron. 15.29, is addressed in this thesis.

¹¹ See, e.g., the titles of Graham, Hoglund and McKenzie 1997; Graham and McKenzie 1999; Graham, Knoppers and McKenzie 2003.

correct or repress or supplant the history in his sources, and neither did he seek to write an authoritative commentary to accompany them. Rather, his aim was to re-present or re-paint or re-cast Israel's history in a way that would advance his community's needs. He was a 'theological historiographer'. Furthermore, he exhibited much control over his sources and was careful and deliberate in his methodology.¹²

Turning to Samuel¹³, the book narrates overlapping histories of the priest/prophet/judge Samuel (1 Samuel 1–25), King Saul (1 Samuel 9–2 Samuel 1) and King David (1 Samuel 16–2 Samuel 24). David is the main plot in the book. Samuel and Saul and their families, as well as the priestly family of Eli and the ark, are subplots which support and enhance the story of David. Nonetheless, the story of David is complex, and far from being an idealised hero, Israel's second and greatest monarch spends more (narrative) time clashing with and fleeing from Saul (1 Samuel 18–29) and Absalom (2 Samuel 13–19) than he does seated on the throne. Without the royal house of David, Israel would not have survived, although Samuel makes this house and its subjects answerable to firm standards of prophetic justice. In the end, Samuel's portrait of David is a holographic representation of Israel's experience from conquest to exile. The book is a work of national self-criticism. David, like Israel, is chosen, and David, like Israel, receives blessing for obedience and punishment for sin. Neither, however, is abandoned by Yahweh. The house of David and the nation of Israel will be punished and preserved. Samuel offers hope to those doubting Yahweh's covenant promises.¹⁴

Since Rost's *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids* (1926) and Noth's *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (1943), the history of research on Samuel's literary

¹² Brettler 1995: 20–47; Fishbane 1985: 380–407; Shinan and Zakovitch 1986; Steiner 1992: 134–151, 324–325. In more detail: Willi 1972 and especially Kalimi 1989, 1995, 2000, 2004.

¹³ Besides introductions and commentaries, see Flanagan 1992; Gordon 1984; Klein 1999; McCarter 1994; esp. Dietrich and Naumann 1995. On Samuel within the Former Prophets/Deuteronomistic History see Auld 1998; McKenzie 1992. It is unnecessary to discuss here many issues related to Samuel.

¹⁴ Bergen 1996: 32–37; Rosenberg 1987: 141–143.

history focuses on the discernment of diverse traditions within the book which one or more Deuteronomistic editors united into a single composition as part of a larger history of Israel from conquest to exile (Joshua–Kings; prefaced by Deuteronomy). Scholars discern the following blocks of material in Samuel:

1 Sam. 1.1-4.1a	Traditions centred at Shiloh regarding the priestly family of Eli and the priest/prophet/judge Samuel
1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2, perhaps 2 Sam. 6.1-23	<u>The Ark Narrative</u> (AN)
1 Sam. 7.3-15.35	Traditions concerning Saul and the advent of kingship
1 Sam. 16.1–2 Sam. 5.12	<u>The History of David's Rise</u> (HDR)
2 Sam. 9.1-20.26	<u>The Succession Narrative or Court History of David</u> (SN or CH)
2 Sam. 21.1-24.25, diverse material in 5.13-25; 7.1-29; 8.1-18	Traditions (as an appendix) concerning David

Some assume a prophetic stratum containing part or all of Samuel between the earlier sources and the later Deuteronomistic editors. The methodology for discerning these originally independent blocks of material involves the affirmation of (1) particular yet distinct themes *in each block*, especially in the AN, HDR, and SN/CH, and (2) conflicts or duplications *between the blocks*. See 2.2. By consensus, the Deuteronomistic editors of Samuel compiled the earlier sources into a chronological and coherent story, but unlike Judges and Kings, they rarely intervened in these sources. Many think this hands-off procedure accounts for (1) the loose connections between the blocks of material and (2) the relative absence of Deuteronomistic vocabulary and subject matter. In the original formulation of his Deuteronomistic History (DH), Noth attributed the following portions of Samuel to the Deuteronomistic editor¹⁵:

¹⁵ Noth 1991: 76-91; cf. Campbell 1994: 59-60. According to Noth, 9.1-10.16 and 10.27b-11.15 in 1 Sam. 7.2-15.35 are source material, and 2 Samuel 21–24 is post-Deuteronomistic, following the separation of the book from the surrounding books.

1 Sam. 2.25b, 34-35; 7.2-17; 8.1-22; 10.17-27a; 12.1-25; 13.1
2 Sam. 2.10a, 11; 5.4-5; 7.1b, 7a, 11a, 12b-13a, 22-24; 8.1aa, 14b

Many since Noth identify additional Deuteronomistic contributions to the book, but these are limited in number in comparison with other books.¹⁶

It is remarkable that sixty years after Noth's epic publication scholars agree over the concept of a DH but disagree over many foundational issues¹⁷, for example: (1) What are the scope and character of the (pre-Deuteronomistic) sources and of the (Deuteronomistic and post-Deuteronomistic) supplements to the original composition of the History? For instance, the extent and intention of the SN/CH (2 Samuel 9–20; 1 Kings 1–2) are hotly debated.¹⁸ Furthermore, many on one hand give a pre-exilic date to this pre-Deuteronomistic source (Blum, Brueggemann, Dietrich, Eissfeldt, Gunn, Kaiser, Keys, Naumann, Noth, Rost, Seiler, Von Rad, Whybray), although they disagree considerably over the century to which it belongs; but on the other hand, Auld, McKenzie and Van Seters give an exilic or post-exilic date to this composition. (2) Was the History composed in the pre-exilic period and then updated in the exilic/post-exilic period (Boling, Clements, Cross, Friedman, Knoppers, Levenson, Mayes, Nelson, O'Brien, Provan, Weippert—especially the 'Harvard school' [Dtr¹, Dtr²]), or was it composed in the exilic/post-exilic period (Noth, Hoffmann, V. P. Long, McConville, Peckham, Polzin), or was it composed and then updated in the exilic/post-exilic period (Dietrich, Klein, McKenzie, Person, Smend, Van Seters, Veijola, Würthwein—especially the 'Göttingen school' [DtrG, DtrP, DtrN])? Was the History the product of a 'Deuteronomistic school' active over much time (Lohfink, Nicholson, Person, Weinfeld, etc.)?

¹⁶ Only 39 of 249 features in Weinfeld 1972: 320-359 appear in Samuel; cf. Alvarez 1994: 49-69.

¹⁷ Person 2000: 1-15; cf. the titles and contents of Knoppers and McConville 2000; McKenzie and Graham 1994; de Moor and van Rooy 2000; de Pury, Römer and Macchi 1996 = de Pury, Römer and Macchi 2000; Römer 2000; Shearing and McKenzie 1999.

¹⁸ De Pury and Römer 2000; cf. Frolov 2002.

The following matters raise doubts about the conventional perspective on the literary history of Samuel. First, scholars disagree on the scope (start and end), purpose and date of the supposed sources of the book, and the same can be said for the editorial layers within these. The characterisation of the hypothetical sources varies with each scholar. Second, there is *relatively greater* agreement concerning the limits and nature of the AN, the HDR and the SN/CH than on the other supposed sources. It is not by coincidence that these have *names*. Yet a review of recent literature shows that scholars still disagree concerning many facets of these supposed sources. In particular, were 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2 and 2 Sam. 6.1-23 originally a single document or is one story written as a prologue or epilogue to the another? See 1.2.2. And what exactly are 1 Sam. 1.1-4.1a and 7.3-15.35 and 2 Sam. 5.13-25; 7.1-29; 8.1-18; and 21.1-24.25? Scholars often speak about 'traditions' in each of these sections of Samuel, and the last is frequently designated an 'appendix' or 'epilogue' to the book. 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18 suffers the greatest neglect in this regard. Outlines respecting the supposed sources frequently chart the sections within 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18 independently rather than under a common heading.

1 Sam. 16.1–2 Sam. 5.12	= HDR
2 Sam. 5.13-25	= ?
2 Sam. 6.1-23	
2 Sam. 7.1-29	
2 Sam. 8.1-18	
2 Sam. 9.1-20.26	= SN/CH

What is this material and how should one call it? Childs suggests that 'the difficulty of determining the structure of the book seems to arise from the long history of transmission. At various stages in the development the material functioned in different ways and vestiges of several organisational schemes are still evident'.¹⁹ Conversely, it is unclear how 'the material' in Samuel functioned independently or in any other 'organisational scheme'. Third, since the late 1960s/early 1970s practitioners of 'new literary criticism' or

¹⁹ Childs 1979: 267.

'narrative criticism' have written many synchronic or holistic or final-form readings of the *book* which suggest that its contents and contours are not susceptible to the sharp distinctions made by source and redaction critics. For example: Alter, Bar-Efrat, Brueggemann, Fokkelman, Garsiel, Polzin, and to give more: Alonso Schökel, B. T. Arnold, Auld, Bergen, Berlin, Clines, Conroy, Eslinger, Exum, Flanagan, R. P. Gordon, Gros Louis, Gunn, Humphreys, Jobling, V. P. Long, Miscall, Rosenberg. These and others have identified thematic and/or structural and/or linguistic links between 2 Samuel 5–8 and 21–24, 2 Samuel 2–4 and 9–20, 1 Samuel 4–7 and 2 Samuel 6, 1 Samuel 1–3 and 4–7, 1 Samuel 1–2 and 2 Samuel 22–23, to give some, and there are many links between the stories of David and Saul (1 Samuel 16–31) and David and Absalom (2 Samuel 13–20).²⁰ This thesis will elaborate on connections between the story of David's transfer of the ark in 2 Samuel 6 and other passages in Samuel. The cumulative evidence suggests that the literary history of Samuel is inadequate in conventional perspective, and must be freshly unfolded.

1.2 David's Transfer of the Ark

1.2.1 Introduction

The noun אֲרוֹן appears 202 times.²¹ Cognate terms are widespread in Semitic languages but the etymology is uncertain. In the Bible the term may refer to a secular or religious chest. The secular usage is rare, occurring once in Gen. 50.26 for Joseph's coffin²² and six times in Kings and Chronicles for a coffer or money-chest (2 Kgs. 12.10,

²⁰ See 2.1 and appendix 5.

²¹ In general: G. H. Davies 1962a; Grintz and Freedman 1972; Hague 1997: 500-510; Seow 1992; Zobel 1974: 363-374; cf. De Vaux 1965: II, 297-302; Clements 1965: 28-39; von Rad 1984; and in more detail, Fretheim 1967; Woudstra 1965.

²² Some connect Joseph's coffin and the canonically later sacred box, e.g., Görg 2000.

11 // 2 Chron. 24.8, 10, 11 [twice]). Elsewhere, אֲרוֹן (195 times) refers to a sacred box.²³ Ninety percent of these occurrences are in Samuel (61 times)²⁴, Chronicles (48 times)²⁵, Joshua (30 times), Exodus (26 times) and Kings (12 times).²⁶ Only 51 references to the ark occur without any qualification, and very few of these occur without an antecedent with a fuller name for the ark. In total there are 29 different designations for the ark, 60 (118 times) percent with an appellation related to the deity—usually *either* יהוה or אֱלֹהִים—and 40 percent (77 times) without one—usually אֲרוֹן alone or with עֲדוּת or בְּרִית. The designations (and distribution) of אֲרוֹן indicate the complex significance of ancient Israel's sacred box.²⁷

The ark has aroused more curiosity and conjecture than any other Israelite cult object. On one hand, referring to David's transfer of the ark to Jerusalem in 2 Samuel 6, Noth said 'In fact the position in world history which Jerusalem has occupied ever since is due to this very act'²⁸, but on the other, and less than ten years following Noth's statement, G. H. Davies said 'the accounts of the ark in the Old Testament are beset with the most difficult and tantalising problems'.²⁹ He lists eighteen difficulties regarding many facets of the ark (or arks?), and he discusses three of these in greater detail: the origin, the mobility, and the significance and function of the ark. *These remain unresolved.*

The history of the ark. Was there one or several arks in ancient Israel? Did it originate within Israel, during Israel's nomadic period in the wilderness, or was it taken

²³ There are also *allusions* to Israel's sacred box; cf. G. H. Davies 1962a: 225-226; Seow 1992: 387-388.

²⁴ אֲרוֹן occurs in 1 Samuel 3-7 and 2 Samuel 6-7 and elsewhere only in 1 Sam. 14.18 and 2 Sam. 11.11; 15.24-25, 29.

²⁵ אֲרוֹן occurs in 1 Chronicles 13-17 and elsewhere in 1 Chron 6.16; 22.19; 28.2, 18; 2 Chron. 1.4; 5.2, 4-10; 6.11; 8.11; 35.3.

²⁶ The religious use of אֲרוֹן appears 195 times in 189 verses in 50 chapters. It occurs 41 times in the Pentateuch, 104 times in the Former Prophets, once in the Latter Prophets, and 49 times in the Writings.

²⁷ See appendix 2. This complexity is augmented by the difficulty in reading 'ark' or 'ephod' in a number of passages in Samuel. See the discussion of MT 1 Sam. 14.18 in 3.1.2.3 and the comments on 'ephod' in 5.1.3.7.

²⁸ Noth 1958: 190.

²⁹ G. H. Davies 1966: 30.

over from the Canaanites, after Israel entered Canaan? Critical examinations have shown that these and other questions cannot be effortlessly or precisely answered. The use of אֲרוֹן in Samuel is especially suspect, and many doubt the historicity of the stories in 1 Samuel 4–7 and 2 Samuel 6. Why are these passages replete with textual and interpretative difficulties? Does the ark really disappear from 1 Sam. 7.2 to 2 Sam. 6.2 or does *MT* 1 Sam. 14.18 indicate the presence and use of the ark during Saul's monarchy? Why, after David places the ark in Jerusalem, is it virtually absent and unused in the remainder of Samuel (only in 2 Sam. 11.11; 15.24, 25, 29; cf. 7.2). Finally, what was the ultimate fate of the ark?

The meaning of the ark. There is greater agreement on the significance and function of the ark. Most think its meaning should be considered in relation to other ancient parallels that bear a resemblance, but there is no indisputable correlation to Israel's ark. Was the ark a war palladium (a sacred safeguard), or a tent shrine or miniature temple in which the deity was thought to be present, or a throne-seat or footstool for the deity who was invisibly seated there, or a container symbolising divine leadership or presence? The common denominator is that the biblical ark is the representation of the deity's immanence or presence. What was the conceptual and historical relationship of the ark to the tent/tabernacle, mercy-seat and cherubim? What was inside the ark and why: tablets of the law, jar of manna, Aaron's rod? Do various literary strata (e.g., 'P', Deuteronomy, 'the AN', Chronicles) attest a continuous history and meaning for the ark?

1.2.2 David's Transfer of the Ark in Samuel

The history of research on the ark has focused on the book of Samuel.³⁰ Wellhausen argued that the priestly description of the ark in the Pentateuch is younger than the portrait drawn in Samuel, and Rost solidified the case by arguing that the AN was a tenth century BCE document which functioned as the *ἱερὸς λόγος* of the Jerusalem sanctuary.³¹ Rost's hypothesis is addressed below, but the extremely varied perspectives on the history and meaning of the ark in Samuel cannot be addressed here. The following general remarks pertain to various aspects of 2 Samuel 6, the zenith of biblical ark stories.

(1) Structure of 2 Samuel 6: Many consider 2 Sam. 6.1-20a an integral whole with a concentric structure that circles from Jerusalem to Jerusalem (place to place, exit and return, beginning and ending). In addition, many like Rost distinguish between two unconnected traditions in 2 Samuel 6, believing that the Michal material in vv. 16, 20b-23 is secondary. See 5.0 and 6.1.2.2. In this thesis, 2 Sam. 6.1-20a is characterised as follows: the exposition of the main plot (2 Sam. 6.1-5); the inciting incident, initiating the conflict or complication (2 Sam. 6.6-7); the rising action (2 Sam. 6.8-15 [16]); the climax or turning point (2 Sam. 6.17a); and the resolution or denouement or falling action (2 Sam. 6.17b-20a).

(2) Uzzah and Michal in 2 Samuel 6: Many think the parallel Uzzah (vv. 6-8) and Michal (vv. 16, 20b-23) incidents are interruptions, and also reprimands of David's enterprise. Both stories, however, enhance rather than disparage David's character.

³⁰ For research to the 1960s see Fretheim 1967: 1-51, 302-326; Woudstra 1965: 14-27. For research during the 1960-1980s see Campbell 1975: 1-54; 1979; Gordon 1984: 30-34; McCarter 1980a: 23-26; 1984: 173-184; Miller and Roberts 1977: 1-9; Schicklberger 1973: 17-25; Seow 1989: 1-8; Smelik 1989: 128-130 = 1992: 35-39; Stoebe 1973: 127-128; 1994: 183-187. See esp. Dietrich and Naumann 1995: 121-143.

³¹ Rost 1982: 6-34 says the AN comprises 1 Sam. 4.1b-18a, 18-21; 5.1-11ba, 12; 6.1-3ba, 4, 10-14, 16; 6.19-7.1; 2 Sam. 6.1-15, 17-20a.

(3) 2 Samuel 6 and 'P': Scholars assign cultic relevance to many facets of the ark story: the ark and its epithet; the status of Abinadab, his sons Uzzah and Ahio, and Obededom, and the nature of their בָּרִיִּים; the status of the nameless transporters in the second attempt; the mood (rejoicing), sounds (voices, instruments) and movements (dance) in each attempt; the threshing floor; Michal at the window; the sacrifices; the tent; David's 'self-revelation', clothing (ephod), blessing and distribution of food-stuff; and the significance of the new cart pulled by oxen and Uzzah's extending his hand, each of which has been interpreted as an instance of cultic error. Many believe David and Uzzah erred in the first attempt to transfer the ark (2 Sam. 6.1-10) by failing to observe *priestly* regulations regarding the transport of the ark.³² In his second attempt (2 Sam. 6.11-20a) David supposedly rectified this cultic error.³³ Conversely, and somewhat inconsistently, many scholars use David's *priestly* activity in 2 Sam. 6.13-20a as both a source and illustration of the theme 'royal priesthood' or 'sacral kingship', to show that David was a king-priest similar to other ANE kings who were also priests of their deities.³⁴

³² The Pentateuchal legislation (Exodus 25–26, 30, 35, 37, 39–40; Leviticus 16; Numbers 3–4, 7, 10; Deuteronomy 10, 31) addresses these matters: (1) the ark is made according to exact specifications; (2) the ark contains the covenant between Yahweh and Israel; (3) the meeting place between Yahweh and Moses is before the ark; (4) the ark is separated from the people in the sanctuary and/or behind/under a curtain or screen; (5) the Levites are responsible for the proper care and transport of the ark, including its transportation on their shoulders using poles placed through rings in the ark; (6) the ark travels ahead of Israel on her journeys by a period/distance of three days. The last point is declarative rather than legislative. Levitical portage (נָשָׂא) of the ark also appears in Joshua 3–4, 6, 8; 1 Samuel 4; 2 Samuel 15; 1 Kings 2, 8; 1 Chronicles 15; 2 Chronicles 5.

³³ This view is argued at length in Kleven 1991, 1992. He emphasises the centrality of vv. 13–14 in the story since they (supposedly) describe three changes David made after the failed attempt to transfer the ark (transport on foot, sacrifices, priestly garment). Consequently, David overlooked the law, but in the end he learned and changed. Wright 2002 argues that the second attempt to move the ark is marked by *reformation* in ritual and *intensification* of devotion and piety. There are significant problems with Wright's approach: (1) assumptions concerning the story's historical setting and date; (2) *ad hoc* use of the versions alongside the facile emendation of the MT; (3) heavy reliance on the 'late' Michal material to construe the interpretation of David's dance; (4) recourse to 'late' and 'priestly' material to explain terminology and concepts in MT Samuel; (5) assertion that cultic error/flaw is the basis for David's reforms; and (6) misreading the circumstantial clauses as finite (see 5.0), thus failing to recognise that the story does not describe the movement of the ark in the interval from start to finish.

³⁴ For other passages and some discussion see Cazelles 1992.

(4) 2 Samuel 6 and Psalm 132: One segment of scholarship on 2 Samuel 6 takes its point of departure from Mowinckel.³⁵ He associated the ark procession in 2 Samuel 6 with an annual enthronement festival of Yahweh, and more particularly with Psalm 132.³⁶ However, most are doubtful about the concept of an annual enthronement festival of Yahweh, and most believe 2 Samuel 6 is the source, rather than the reflex, of Psalm 132. Furthermore, most seem to think that the (seed of the) story of David's transfer of the ark is history rather than fiction or myth.

(5) 2 Samuel 6 and 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18: This material seeks to demonstrate Yahweh's choice of David and Jerusalem. A chiasmic structure is identified and developed by Flanagan.³⁷ Many recognise the verbal, thematic and structural links, and the central role of 2 Samuel 6, within this material.³⁸ Finally, the placement of the ark transfer within the chronology of the life of David is disputed. Most place it near the beginning of his career, as related in Samuel and Chronicles, but many recognise that the presentation of events in Samuel is dischronologised in favour of a thematic arrangement.³⁹ Accordingly, Merrill argues that David took the ark to Jerusalem late in his reign.⁴⁰

(6) 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2: The history of the ark in this material seems straightforward. The ark is taken from Shiloh into battle against the Philistines, but the

³⁵ Mowinckel 1922. Seow 1989: 2-4 (cf. 145-203) summarises the views of Mowinckel, Engnell, Bentzen and Kraus.

³⁶ Compare 2 Samuel 6 // Ps. 132.1-9 and 2 Samuel 7 // Ps. 132.10-18. Other Psalms are mentioned in this regard, but their setting is far from clear, and numerous hypotheses have been proposed to explain their relationship to 2 Samuel 6.

³⁷ Flanagan 1983.

³⁸ Earlier scholars recognised some of these, e.g., Carlson 1964: 58 on *verba associandi*. On the themes in this material see Brueggemann 1992: 970; Smelik 1989: 139-140 = 1992: 51-53.

³⁹ Bright 1981: 198-199; Flanagan 1979: 238; 1983: 361-362; Gelandner 1991: 33, 138; Glatt 1993: 57-60; Halpern 2001: 333-337; Japhet 1993: 287; Mazar 1963; McCarter 1984: 175-176. Bailey 1990 concludes that Absalom's revolt occurred early in David's reign and his marriage to Bathsheba took place following the revolt. Flanagan 1972: 173 and McKenzie 2000: 132-135 argue that 2 Samuel 11-12 is a secondary insertion in its context. Greenberg 2002 *passim* discusses many instances of dischronologisation in Samuel.

⁴⁰ Merrill 1989; cf. 1987: 238-248.

Israelites are defeated and the ark is lost (1 Sam. 4.1b-22). After a seven month sojourn in the land of the Philistines (1 Samuel 5), the Philistines under divine duress return the ark to the Israelites, and in turn they convey it to Beth-shemesh and then abandon it in Kiriath-jearim (1 Sam. 6.1-7.2). The ark remains in Kiriath-jearim (or does it? [MT 1 Sam. 14.18]) for a number of decades until David brings it to Jerusalem (2 Samuel 6). There are many thematic, structural and terminological links between the two ark stories, and also notable differences, such as the place and personal names and the Levites' absence from 2 Samuel 6.⁴¹ As stated previously, much scholarship on 2 Samuel 6 takes its point of departure from Rost's hypothesis of an AN, but many now think the stories are a literary layer rather than an independent source.⁴² Most assume that 2 Samuel 6 was composed in response to 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2, but some explore the possibility that the canonically earlier story presupposes, foreshadows or reinterprets the later one.⁴³ Also, some explore the significance of the ark stories in an exilic or post-exilic context: just as Yahweh overcame the Philistine oppressors and journeyed to Jerusalem in triumph, so too the people of the exile would be freed from their Babylonian captors and journey back to Jerusalem.⁴⁴ However, this writer thinks the relationship between these chapters can be framed more precisely. Scholars recognise that the principal topic is Yahweh rather than

⁴¹ Blenkinsopp 1972: 71-74; Steussy 1999: 59. See appendix 4.

⁴² Fokkelman 1993: 1-316; Polzin 1989: 18-71; Van Seters 1983: 346-353; also Gitay 1992; Na'aman 1992; Smelik 1989 = 1992. These are dependent on Willis 1971, 1972, 1979. Tur-Sinai 1951 believes 1 Samuel 6 and 2 Samuel 6 represent variant traditions regarding a single divine visitation. For a review of the evidence for and against the hypothesis see Eynikel 2000.

⁴³ Schicklberger 1973: 144-148; also Auld 2003: 233. Albertz 1994: I, 300 n. 31 and Polzin 1989: 68 seem to affirm this view. P. R. Davies 1976: 16-17 thinks 1 Sam. 5.1-7.2 developed from 2 Samuel 6. Linguistic, literary and ideological issues are thought to favour this view. For this writer, the significant language items are אשם (1 Sam. 6.3-4, 8, 17), הלויים (1 Sam. 6.15), קריית-יערים (1 Sam. 6.21-7.2), and perhaps ארון ברית-יהוה (1 Sam. 4.3, 4, 5). In particular, this writer believes the totality of the evidence indicates that the ark was originally associated with Baal(ah) Judah (2 Sam. 6.2; 1 Chron. 13.6), then with Kiriath-jearim (1 Sam. 6.21-7.2; 1 Chron. 13.5-6), and finally with Gibeah (2 Sam. 5.25; 6.3-4).

⁴⁴ Lorenzin 2001; Timm 1966. Also: Ackroyd 1971: 52, 63; Ahlström 1984: 143-144; Auld 2003: 218; Conroy 1983: 27-28; Gordon 1984: 36-37; Klein 1983: 61; Smelik 1989: 140-144 = 1992: 53-58; Van Seters 1983: 352; cf. Brueggemann 2002.

the ark itself (theodicy) and that there is a progression from an old to a new epoch (transition) in these stories. Many comment on the deity's autonomy in both sets of passages. In 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2, he refuses to fight, he allows himself to be captured, he consents to be moved back and forth, he pours out wrath on both the Philistines and the people of Beth-shemesh, and he miraculously guides the milch cows upon his return. In 2 Samuel 6, he maliciously slaughters Uzzah and then strangely blesses Obed-edom. Polzin rightly says '1 Samuel 4–6 looks to the triumphant David of 2 Samuel 6'.⁴⁵ Consequently, David's victory may be construed as his situating the deity in a permanent abode, whereby the deity becomes predictable and manageable. See below. Furthermore, whereas the loss of the ark signals the end of the house of Eli (1 Sam. 4.12-18), the recovery of the ark under Davidic patronage occasions the end of Saul's house (2 Sam. 6.20b-23). The house which remains is David's. In an exilic context, hope for the reinstatement of Davidic kingship symbolises the reinstatement of Yahweh's presence among his people.

(7) Purpose of 2 Samuel 6: Birch provides a good list and discussion of interpretations of 2 Samuel 6.⁴⁶ The narrative of David's transfer of the ark to Jerusalem is interpreted as an ideological vehicle which blends continuity and contrast (e.g., ancient and 'modern', northern and southern) in order to substantiate political, religious and social change in ancient Israel.⁴⁷ This change revolves around three groups of people and places in Samuel:

Eli and Samuel, Shiloh, Ephraim, 1 Sam. 1.1-8.22.
Saul, Gibeah, Benjamin, 1 Sam. 9.1–2 Sam. 5.12.
David, Jerusalem, Judah, 2 Sam. 5.13-24.25.

Consequently, the common denominator in treatments of 2 Samuel 6 is *the legitimisation of Davidic rule and its locus in Jerusalem*. This explanation of 2 Samuel 6 is compelling,

⁴⁵ Polzin 1989: 71.

⁴⁶ Birch 1998: 1247-1248.

⁴⁷ Ahlström 1994: 471-472; Bright 1981: 200-201; Brueggemann 1990: 247-253; 1992: 968-970; Flanagan 1979, 1983, 1988: 193-272; Halpern 2001: 333-336; McCarter 1983; Noth 1958: 190.

yet inadequate, for this reason: The ark's importance in 2 Samuel 6 is assumed—never asserted or explained—and consequently one must presume that the events in the earlier ark story and the events in the narrative lapse between that story and the present one seek to construe the manner in which David's ark transfer should be interpreted. Consequently, this writer prefers to construe David's act in 2 Samuel 6 as a triumph for him in relation to both the deity and the former monarch: *2 Samuel 6 narrates a dialectic between the enigmatic character and doings of Yahweh, who mysteriously kills and blesses, and between the firm intentions of King David, who succeeds in settling the potent deity in a fixed abode and in displacing the regime of the Saulide dynasty. David's triumphs over deity and king re-orient in his favour the religious and political spheres of Israel. In essence, David successfully elicits Yahweh's blessing of his/His (sacred and royal) houses.*⁴⁸ The last statement is confirmed by Yahweh himself in 2 Sam. 7.11b-16, and several other investigations explicitly affirm this interpretation of 2 Samuel 6.⁴⁹

(8) Editorial activity in 2 Samuel 6: Excluding the insertion of vv. 16, 20b-23, most limit editorial activity to vv. 5, 15, and perhaps vv. 13-14. In addition, some consider the relative clause in v. 21 a gloss.

(9) Text and sense in 2 Samuel 6: Many recognise that 2 Samuel 6 is rife with textual difficulties. Furthermore, it is not uncommon to read the following words for the

⁴⁸ Murray 1998 construes David's removal of the ark as an exceedingly negative act of ambition and intended divine manipulation. There is a drastic difference between David's overt actions and his covert intentions. A harmonious relationship between David and Yahweh appears on the surface, but undercurrents within this relationship gradually rise and become the governing drift in the tide of events in 2 Sam. 5.17-7.29. When at war in 2 Sam. 5.17-25 David seems most at home with Yahweh, but his return home in 2 Samuel 6-7 is to a kind of war with Yahweh. In short, 'David's difference' with Yahweh is rooted in his royal pretension versus Yahweh's robust assertion of divine prerogative. Murray 1998: 307-311 summarises his argument. Murray supports his thesis by a persistent focus on allegedly negative features of the text, including not least Yahweh's bursting forth against Uzzah. However, his approach is extremely subjective, and beset with methodological difficulties, including dependence on underlying textual meanings and references to David's 'interior monologue' and 'covert intentions'. Contrary to Murray, this writer argues that David does not suffer defeats and setbacks in the Uzzah and Michal episodes, but rather, he overcomes both Yahweh and Saul in achieving his religious and political agendas.

⁴⁹ Gelandner 1991: 137; Matthews 2003: 16-18.

language and portrayals in 2 Samuel 6: abrupt, terse, laconic, cryptic, enigmatic, puzzling, ambiguous, unclear, etc. However, few connect the two phenomena, still fewer connect these to the editorial history of the passage, and still fewer investigate the implications of these issues for understanding the history of the text and story in 1 Chronicles 13, [14], 15–16.

1.2.3 David's Transfer of the Ark in Chronicles

Research on David's ark transfer focuses on Samuel. In turn, research on the synoptic material in Chronicles concerns itself with explaining the 'reworking' of the original story. First, what are the reasons for the changes—additions, subtractions and modifications—in Chronicles vis-à-vis Samuel? Scholars increasingly recognise that some of these differences were already in the *Vorlage* of the book of Chronicles. The synoptic material in 13.5-14, 15.25-16.3, and 16.43 is investigated in detail in chapters 3–6. Second, what are the reasons for the location of the material in 14.1-17 and for the insertion of 13.1-4, 15.1-24 and 16.4-42? Third, what literary strata are evident in 15.1-24 and 16.4-42? What in these chapters is Chronistic and what is post-Chronistic? Fourth, what is the origin and significance of the songs in 16.7-36? Are they primary or secondary to the synoptic material in Psalms? Fifth, what interests and themes moulded the story of David's ark transfer in Chronicles? What influence did 'P' exert on the Chronicler's history? Finally, it should be pointed out that de Wette used Chronicles' ark story for showing the unreliability of the book⁵⁰, and Fishbane, and in more detail Brettler, use Chronicles' ark story to elucidate the editorial procedures of biblical

⁵⁰ De Wette 1806: 85-91.

historiographers.⁵¹ The following remarks deal with several important aspects of 1 Chronicles 13–16.

(1) Structure of 1 Chronicles 13–16: This material may be outlined as follows:

- 13.1-14 David attempts to transport the ark to Jerusalem
- 14.1-17 David consolidates his kingdom under Yahweh's blessing
- 15.1-24 David prepares to transport the ark to Jerusalem
 (tent, assembly, transporters, musicians)
- 15.25-16.3 David transports the ark to Jerusalem
- 16.4-43 David prepares for Yahweh's cultic service
 (musicians, songs, servants)

A synoptic comparison of 2 Samuel 5–6, 23 and 1 Chronicles 11–16 reveals several differences between the two presentations.

David is made king over Israel at Hebron 2 Sam. 5.1-5 // 1 Chron. 11.1-3	
David captures Jebus/Jerusalem 2 Sam. 5.6-10 // 1 Chron. 11.4-9	
David consolidates his kingdom 2 Sam. 5.11-25 // 1 Chron. 14.1-17	
	The role of David's mighty warriors 1 Chron. 11.10-12.41 // 2 Sam. 23.8-39
	<i>David proposes to bring the ark to Jerusalem</i> 1 Chron. 13.1-4
David goes to fetch the ark and Uzzah is slaughtered 2 Sam. 6.1-11 // 1 Chron. 13.5-14	
	David consolidates his kingdom 1 Chron. 14.1-17 // 2 Sam. 5.11-25
	<i>David prepares to bring the ark to Jerusalem</i> 1 Chron. 15.1-24
David brings the ark to Jerusalem and blesses the people 2 Sam. 6.12-19a // 1 Chron. 15.25-16.3	
	<i>David prepares for Yahweh's cultic service</i> 1 Chron. 16.4-42
The people return home and David returns to bless his house 2 Sam. 6.19b-20a // 1 Chron. 16.43	
<i>Michal the daughter of Saul chides David</i> 2 Sam. 6.20b-23	
The role of David's mighty warriors 2 Sam. 23.8-39 // 1 Chron. 11.10-12.41	

Chronicles diverges from Samuel in (a) the alternate placement of the material in 11.10-12.41 and 14.1-17; (b) the pluses in 13.1-4, 15.1-24 and 16.4-42; and (c) the minus of 2 Sam. 6.20b-23.

⁵¹ Brettler 1995: 26-34, 43-45; Fishbane 1985: 392-394.

(2) 13.1-4 plus: The following matters are spotlighted. (a) Consultation. David's decision is made in consultation and agreement with the entire gamut of Israel's leaders. (b) Democratisation. The people are not limited to playing the role of accompanying crowd or audience. The focus of the nation's worship, later identified with the temple, is thus understood as the inheritance of all the people, not just one section within it. (c) 'All Israel'. The feature of assembling all the people for major occasions is a recurrent theme in Chronicles (e.g., 1 Chron. 23.1; 28.1; 2 Chron. 1.2; 5.2; 30.1-5). Regarding the relationship between David and the people, there is a constant process of broadening: David, the commanders, the present assembly, the people who remain in all the land of Israel, (the priests and Levites, the whole assembly, all the people,) all Israel from the Shihor of Egypt to the entrance of Hamath.⁵² (d) Priests and Levites. These are introduced since 'everything must be done according to P'.⁵³ The priests appear in 13.2; 15.11, 14, 24; 16.6, 39 and the Levites in 13.2; 15.2, 4, 11-12, 14-17, 22, 26 (// 2 Sam. 6.13), 27 (// 2 Sam. 6.14); 16.4. (e) Motif of 'seeking'. Seeking God and by proper means is key to 1 Chronicles 10–16. Observe פָּרַץ in 10.13, 14; 13.3; 15.13; 16.11.⁵⁴ (f) Saul as foil. This theme is related to the previous one. Faithful kings seek God.⁵⁵

(3) 14.1-17 placement: David consolidates his kingdom in the three month period between his initial effort (13.5-14) and final success (15.25-16.3) in transporting the ark. He receives gifts from Hiram, his family grows, and he achieves a double victory over the Philistines. This arrangement is considered part of a wider pattern in Chronicles in which a king's military victories and his sovereignty over other peoples are understood as consequences that result from seeking Yahweh.⁵⁶ However: (a) The Chronicler probably

⁵² Japhet 1993: 274.

⁵³ Curtis and Madsen 1910: 204.

⁵⁴ Another key term in this material is פָּרַץ, in 13.2, 11; 14.11; 15.13.

⁵⁵ Japhet 1993: 276.

⁵⁶ Selman 1994: 149.

did not make the same distinction between sacred and secular which we moderns make.

(b) Some question whether the arrangement of the stories in Chronicles is secondary.⁵⁷ (c)

The Chronicler's technique of dischronologisation⁵⁸ is also evident in 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18 (see above). *Both stories are equally tendentious in this regard.*

(4) 15.1-24 plus: David makes several other arrangements in the same three month period following his initial effort (13.5-14) and final success (15.25-16.3) in transporting the ark. He arranges a tent for the ark, gathers the people, and prepares levitical transporters and levitical musicians for the ark's removal to Jerusalem. These arrangements were in keeping with 'P' and the festivity of the occasion. The Chronicler's resolution of the failure of the first attempt to move the ark to Jerusalem is achieved by recourse to Torah. This theme, in turn, is related to the Chronicler's interest in retribution.⁵⁹

(5) 16.4-42 plus: Following the successful transport of the ark to Jerusalem (15.25-16.3), but prior to the story's end (16.43), David prepares levitical musicians and servants for Yahweh's cultic service, and he also designates songs to be sung by the levitical choirs.⁶⁰ The greater narrative space given in Chronicles to the transfer of the ark, and the sustained interest throughout in the Levites, suggest that the telling of David's religious and political act is a vehicle for (anachronistically) legitimating the cultic role of the Levites in (post-exilic) Israelite religion.⁶¹

⁵⁷ Auld 2000b: 141-142.

⁵⁸ Glatt 1993: 57-60. Kalimi 1993 discusses the phenomenon of 'literary-chronological proximity' in Chronicles.

⁵⁹ Kelly 1996: 72-79.

⁶⁰ Kleinig 1993: 133-148.

⁶¹ Dempsey 1998: 237; Eskenazi 1995: 268-271; Kleinig 1993: 144; cf. Hanson 1992.

1.3 Versions of Samuel and Chronicles

1.3.1 Introduction

The textual witnesses to the books of Samuel and Chronicles stand at the centre of this thesis (see chapter 2). The study of the versions is complicated since each one has a lengthy and unique textual and exegetical history in the hands of successive generations of editors and copyists.⁶²

The received or rabbinic Hebrew version, 'the Masoretic Text' (MT), comes to us *in toto* following a lengthy period of Masoretic activity (ca. 500-1000 CE) in relatively late manuscripts. The earliest and most important are the Aleppo (925 CE) and Leningrad (1009 CE) codices. In actual fact, 'the MT' is misleading since there is not just one text but a variety of manuscripts which represent the 'Masoretic Family' or 'Masoretic Group' of texts. Nonetheless, there is relative uniformity among these since sometime near the end of the first or early in the second century CE the rabbis selected one text ('the proto-MT') from among several alternative texts of each book of the Bible, and established it as the normative or authoritative text of that book ('the *textus receptus*'), thus eliminating variant lines of tradition in normative Judaism. See 2.3.2.1.

For several centuries biblical scholars have recognised the value of ancient translations for grasping the earlier history of the texts which became the basis of the Masoretic family of texts. The earliest and most important of these is the translation of the Bible into Greek, which was accomplished in Alexandria in Egypt by men of Palestinian origin in the third and second centuries BCE. The original translation comprised only the Torah, and only it was known as the Septuagint (LXX). However, since the first centuries CE the term 'Septuagint' has come to signify the Greek Scriptures in their entirety, including other ancient Greek translations and revisions as well as books which are not

⁶² Fernández Marcos 2000; Tov 1997a; 2001.

part of Hebrew Bible canon. Consequently, it is customary to refer to the first or original translation of each book contained in the Septuagint as the 'Old Greek' (OG) translation. The important manuscripts, containing all or almost all books of the Septuagint, are Vaticanus (B; 4th century CE), Sinaiticus (S; 4th century CE) and Alexandrinus (A; 5th century CE).

It is impossible to speak about the Septuagint's character as a whole since each book within it reflects its translator's unique philosophy and capability. Nevertheless, overall the translators sought accuracy. In turn, this concern eventually encouraged a number of revisions of the Septuagint. These were undertaken in the second century CE by three Jews, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, and in the third century CE by Origen and in the fourth century CE by Lucian and perhaps Hesychius, all Christians. These revisers sought to (1) correct mistakes, (2) improve and update language and style, (3) adapt the Greek texts to the current Hebrew texts of the Bible, and (4) explain difficulties and make the text more appropriate for public usage. The fact that these revisions were based directly or indirectly on Hebrew texts meant that they increasingly differed from the Hebrew texts which underlay the original translations into Greek.⁶³

The discovery beginning in 1947 of biblical scrolls in the region of the Dead Sea has enormously increased our knowledge of the biblical text. Thus far, scholars have reconstructed more than two hundred biblical manuscripts from many thousands of fragments which range in date from the end of the third century BCE into the first century CE. These manuscripts attest all books in the Hebrew canon of Scripture with the exception of Esther (and Nehemiah) although there are many more copies of books of the Torah, Isaiah and Psalms than the other seventeen books combined. Perhaps the greatest surprise of the manuscript discoveries, and certainly the most significant for the present

⁶³ (1) Ur- or proto-Lucian and Lucian and (2) Ur-, proto- or *καί γε*-Theodotion and Theodotion, cannot be discussed here.

investigation, are the pluriform texts of the manuscripts. Whereas, for example, 1QIsa^a and 4QJer^a show remarkable agreement with the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah in the MT, 4QSam^a and 4QJer^b agree significantly with the Greek translations of these books. The discovery and publication of the biblical scrolls from the Dead Sea is the watershed event for Septuagintal studies, indeed, for the study of the text of the Bible in general, and especially for Samuel.

This thesis centres on the Hebrew and Greek witnesses to Samuel and Chronicles. However, as for the Greek witnesses, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Josephus are mentioned occasionally, but as corroborative rather than primary evidence. In addition, occasional reference is made to the Aramaic, Syriac (Peshitta, Jacob of Edessa), and Latin (Old Latin [OL], Vulgate) evidence, but once again, these witnesses are corroborative rather than primary. The citations from ancient biblical texts and versions are from the following editions and studies:

Hebrew	Masoretic Text	<i>BHS</i>
	4QSam ^a	Herbert 1997b Fincke 2001 Ulrich 1978 McKenzie 1985 McCarter 1984
Greek	Septuagint	Brooke, McLean and Thackeray 1906-1940 Holmes and Parsons 1798, 1827 Rahlfs 1979 Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz 1986 Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz 1996
	Aquila Symmachus Theodotion	Field 1875 Reider and Turner 1966 The above Septuagint editions
	Theodoret of Cyrrhus	Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz 1984
	Josephus	Thackeray and Marcus 1934 Niese 1885-1895
Aramaic	Targum	Sperber 1959 Le Déaut and Roberts 1971
Syriac	Peshitta	de Boer 1978 Gordon 1998
	Jacob of Edessa	Salvesen 1999
Latin	Old Latin	Sabatier and de La Rue 1743-1749 Vercellone 1860-1864 Morano Rodríguez 1989 Brepols Vetus Latina Database
	Vulgate	Weber 1983

1.3.2 Versions of Samuel

The state of the Masoretic Text of Samuel is routinely the object of highly negative evaluations. It is 'difficult' or 'senseless' or 'faulty' or 'incomplete' or 'corrupt' or 'slightly corrupt' or 'highly corrupt'. Few disagree that MT Samuel is one of the most corrupt and worst preserved biblical books. Most consider MT Samuel defective and haplographic, the latter due to innumerable instances of homoioteleuton. Many cite McCarter's statement:

The received Hebrew text of Samuel in its Masoretic dress (MT) is in poor repair. It is a short text, but its shortness is not the wholesome shortness of a text free of

expansion and interpolation; rather it is the result of countless copying errors and omissions, some of them extensive, scattered throughout the book.⁶⁴

Textual scholars are accustomed to the fact that a *textus receptus* is usually a conflate text, but the reverse is true of MT Samuel. Consequently, for the purpose of emendation scholars for nearly two centuries have relied on the LXX, which was based on a 'better' or 'purer' text of Samuel.

The Old Greek translators rendered their Hebrew *Vorlage* 'literally' but not 'woodenly'. They were 'faithful' to their base text. They did not paraphrase. The language of the translation is 'indifferent' or 'non-idiomatic' Greek. It is not literary κοινή.⁶⁵ LXX Samuel is generally longer and often smoother than the MT. Furthermore, 'the Hebrew underlying the Septuagint is a full text, sometimes conflate, frequently original', such that the Septuagint translation and the MT 'stand at opposite poles in their textual development'.⁶⁶ The most significant Greek manuscripts for the text-critical evaluation of Samuel are Vaticanus (B; LXX^B) and Alexandrinus (A; LXX^A). In Samuel, LXX^B provides a direct link to the OG translation. LXX^A shows systematic revision toward the developing MT.

The previous characterisation must be refined and extended. First, Thackeray, followed by Barthélemy, demonstrated that the Greek books of Kingdoms (Samuel–Kings) in LXX^B were revised by the 'καίγε-recensionist' from 2 Sam. 11.1 onward.⁶⁷ Subsequently, Shenkel set the initial limit at 10.1.⁶⁸ Herbert demonstrated that based on current evidence it can only be said that the reviser took up his task somewhere between 9.6 and 10.6.⁶⁹ In any case, this issue does not directly affect the present investigation

⁶⁴ McCarter 1980a: 5.

⁶⁵ Cross 1995: 132 n. 4; Jellicoe 1968: 283; McCarter 1986: 89; Thackeray 1909: 13.

⁶⁶ Cross 1995: 133 n. 2.

⁶⁷ Barthélemy 1963; Thackeray 1907

⁶⁸ Shenkel 1968.

⁶⁹ Herbert 2002.

since 2 Samuel 6 is outside the parameters of the reviser's efforts. Second, scholars have recognised the value of the Lucianic manuscripts for the text-critical evaluation of MT Samuel.⁷⁰ The manuscripts having the Lucianic recension (LXX^L) in Samuel are 19 (b'), 82 (o), 93 (e₂), 108 (b) and 127 (c₂), frequently referenced as boc₂e₂. On one hand, scholars show that in the καίγε section these cursives provide superior access to the OG. On the other hand, these manuscripts have a remarkably full appearance, and they not infrequently have conflate readings; that is, they have two readings side by side which otherwise are attested individually in the MT and LXX^B. In other words, Lucian revised the Greek version via the Hexapla toward the developing MT tradition, but he frequently did so not by deleting the original reading and inserting the revised one in its place (cf. LXX^A) but rather by inserting the revised reading *alongside* the original one. This is a complex issue. The important point is this: late and conflate LXX^L is often valuable for confirming an OG reading vis-à-vis a more recent or developed reading which is found in the MT or other Greek manuscripts.

The discovery and publication of four Dead Sea scrolls of Samuel is most significant for the study of the text of this book. These manuscripts are 1QSam/1Q7, 4QSam^a/4Q51, 4QSam^b/4Q52 and 4QSam^c/4Q53. Since three of these preserve relatively little of Samuel, and in fact do not contain any of 2 Samuel 6, the present discussion focuses on 4QSam^a, but this should not diminish the value of the other three manuscripts.⁷¹ 4QSam^a was written between 50 and 25 BCE. The extant fragments represent portions of 33 of 55 chapters or approximately 30% of all verses of Samuel. Altogether, less than 10% of the original manuscript has survived. Nevertheless, the significance of the manuscript outdoes this shortfall.

⁷⁰ Busto Saiz 1990; Fernández Marcos 1998; 2000: 223-238; cf. the introductory material in Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz 1989, 1996.

⁷¹ On the contents of the Samuel scrolls see Ulrich 1998b: 655-656. Polak 2000 describes all four manuscripts. Abegg, Flint and Ulrich 1999: 213-259 translates all variant readings in Samuel.

The official editors, Cross and Parry, have published extensively on the scroll⁷², as have a number of other scholars, most notably Tov, Ulrich, Pisano, Polak, Rofé, Treballe Barrera, Catastini, Herbert and Fincke. The key issue is the character of the manuscript in terms of its affinity with other texts of Samuel, mainly the MT and the Septuagint translation(s), but also with Chronicles and other ancient witnesses to Samuel, especially the OL and Josephus. This is a complicated matter.⁷³ Nevertheless, several generalisations are valid.

- 4QSam^a is 'non-aligned', neither proto-Masoretic nor 'Septuagintal'.⁷⁴
- 4QSam^a has independent features which are often overlooked.⁷⁵
- 4QSam^a is closely related to the *Vorlage* of the OG. Consequently, the manuscript vindicates critics such as Thenius, Wellhausen, Driver and H. P. Smith who previously valued highly the Greek translation in their text-critical evaluations of MT Samuel.⁷⁶
- 4QSam^a is not related in a large-scale way to LXX^L.⁷⁷
- 4QSam^a is closely related to the presumed Samuel *Vorlage* of the book of Chronicles in synoptic material.⁷⁸

To sum up, Polak says:

Samuel^a contains some readings that can only be described as variant developments of the reading reflected by the Septuagint; some important variants in the Qumran scroll are not represented in the Masoretic Text or the Septuagint but are reflected in the Greek paraphrase of Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities* (as well as many other variants that also are reflected by the Septuagint ...). The text of the Old Greek used by Josephus was probably even closer to the Qumran scroll than to the Septuagint in its present state. Attempts to minimize the text-critical relevance of the scroll as exegetical and thus secondary vis-à-vis the Masoretic Text seem less plausible. ... But statistical analysis of the available data⁷⁹ ... indicates an undeniable affinity between the Septuagint and Samuel^a: out of more than 180 simple variants (disregarding complex redactional phenomena, long

⁷² Cross 1953 was the first publication.

⁷³ See the caution in Ulrich 1998a: 90.

⁷⁴ Tov 1980: 45-47, 62; 2002: 156; 1997a: 192-194.

⁷⁵ Parry 2002.

⁷⁶ Cross 1953: 23; 1995: 12; Greenspoon 1997: 166.

⁷⁷ Herbert 1997a: 37.

⁷⁸ See the above references and the next section of this thesis.

⁷⁹ Polak 1992.

stretches, and so forth), more than 120 are common to the Septuagint and the scroll. Accordingly, both witnesses seem to belong to one branch of the tradition, but the Septuagint reflects an older state of this text, whereas Samuel^a represents a further development of it. Since the variants characteristic of this branch include many explanatory readings, it appears to embody a recension of an ancient Hebrew text, which makes itself felt in *Chronicles* and not in the Masoretic Text of *Samuel* ... But the Samuel^a and Septuagint variants also include many primary readings that have not been preserved in the Masoretic Text. ... Many of the independent readings of Samuel^a are to be considered secondary, but some are better viewed as primary. ...⁸⁰

There are several dissenting views regarding the agreements of (1) Greek Samuel and 4QSam^a against MT Samuel and (2) 4QSam^a and *Chronicles* against MT Samuel. Regarding the first issue, both prior to and since the discovery of 4QSam^a, some scholars have favoured the MT over other text traditions: Barthélemy, de Boer, Erdmann, Frankel, Gooding, Keil, van der Kooij, Löhr (the reviser of Thenius' commentary), Nöldeke, Nyberg, Rofé and Stoebe.⁸¹ Pisano challenges the agreements given above. He concludes after an analysis of 69 passages where LXX or 4QSam^a differ from the MT by way of a major plus or minus 'that in the vast majority of cases a large plus or minus occurring in the LXX or 4QSam^a vis-à-vis MT indicates a further literary activity by LXX or 4QSam^a'.⁸² In general, Pisano's arguments are unconvincing.⁸³ The present investigation argues that in fact MT Samuel shows a high degree of literary initiative. Regarding the second issue, some suggest or at least raise the possibility that some non-MT Samuel readings in 4QSam^a are the result of *Chronicles*' influence.⁸⁴ This is unlikely.⁸⁵ Finally,

⁸⁰ Polak 2000: 820-821.

⁸¹ Barthélemy, Gooding, Lust and Tov 1986 illustrates the split in viewpoints.

⁸² Pisano 1984: 283. Pisano 1984 deals with vv. 2, 3, 4 and 7 and Pisano 2000 with v. 21 in 2 Samuel 6.

⁸³ Williamson 1986; and at length: Gordon 1992; Treballe Barrera 1986b.

⁸⁴ Van der Kooij 1982: 202 n. 113; Verheij 1990: 13 n. 1; Vermes 1977: 207-208; van der Woude 1992: 166.

⁸⁵ Tov 1999: 282.

Fincke wishes to convince us that the manuscript 4QSam^a was the *Vorlage* of the Greek translation of Samuel.⁸⁶

In addition to Pisano, two other major contributions evaluate 4QSam^a and other versions as textual witnesses to Samuel. Ulrich describes the textual nature of 4QSam^a by charting the scroll's relationship to the MT, to the various forms of the Greek version, and to the narrative of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*. He concludes that the group comprised of 4QSam^a, the OG, LXX^L, the OL, Chronicles and Josephus 'often, especially where the Massoretic text is troubled, provides or points toward an ancient, *preferanda* form of the text of Samuel'.⁸⁷ Several conclusions related to Chronicles are⁸⁸:

- During the first century before the first century of the Christian era, texts of Samuel were extant which at points were much closer to our present Chronicles than to our present MT Samuel.
- 4QSam^a is a Samuel text of a tradition different from MT Samuel, and LXX and proto-LXX^L Samuel are significantly closer to the 4QSam^a tradition than to MT Samuel.
- MT Chronicles never agrees with MT Samuel against 4QSam^a, except for the addition of one preposition (כ in 2 Sam. 10.5). On the other hand, MT Chronicles agrees with 4QSam^a against MT Samuel in 42 readings.
- Furthermore, none of the 4QSam^a and MT Chronicles agreements betrays characteristics commonly associated with Chronicles' specific interests. 4QSam^a is not a late conflation of an old Samuel text corrupted and supplemented by Chronicles' readings. It cannot be proved either that 4QSam^a is a conflation of MT Samuel and MT Chronicles or that MT Chronicles is dependent on 4QSam^a.
- Josephus is solidly and significantly affiliated with the 4QSam^a tradition. Josephus used a text of Samuel strikingly close to 4QSam^a, but that text was in the Greek language, closely connected with LXX and proto-LXX^L Samuel and clearly distinct from both MT Samuel and the *καίγε* and hexaplaric recensions. Furthermore, although Josephus supplemented his narrative with details from Chronicles on rare occasions, these insertions stem from a source in Greek.

⁸⁶ Fincke 2000, 2001. Fincke argued his case at the 2003 SBL meetings in Cambridge and Atlanta. His 'lecture' at the latter was met with incredulity. Ralph Klein gives a candid review of Fincke 2001 at <http://www.ot-studies.com>.

⁸⁷ Ulrich 1978: 259.

⁸⁸ Ulrich 1978: 154, 163-164, 190-191.

Nysse's unpublished doctoral thesis focuses on the relationship between the Greek and Hebrew witnesses in 2 Samuel 1–9. He summarises:

The central contention of this study is that, in 2 Sam 1-9, MSS B, y and a₂ [= G:B+] witness to a distinct Vorlage more clearly than other Greek manuscript groups, specifically b, b', o, c₂ and e₂ (G:L) and MSS A, c and x (G:Acx). That Vorlage is distinct from the Massoretic text (MT) and from the tradition shared by 4QSam^a and Chronicles (Pal). G:B+ is, thus, the best witness to the Old Greek (OG). The witness of G:L to the OG is obscured by proto-Lucianic, hexaplaric and other revisions. G:Acx has undergone extensive hexaplaric revision. Overall, G:B+ cannot be characterized as having undergone revision toward the MT. The OG Vorlage is distinct from the MT and, to a lesser extent, from Pal. These conclusions are reached through a study of the pluses and minuses that arise when G:B+ is compared to G:L (and G:Acx) and when both are in turn compared to the MT. The affiliation of Pal and the Old Latin (OL) is noted when available. Apart from the Lament of David at the end of chapter one, G:B+ strongly attests the OG. It lacks all of the marked hexaplaric readings, differs from 'true' Theodotonic readings, has not been infiltrated by κατ'ε, and contains a substantial number of readings that point to a Vorlage that disagrees with the MT. When G:B+ does agree with the MT over against G:L, the readings are more suggestive of revision in G:L than they are of G:B+ revision toward the MT. G:B+ has a relationship to Pal by virtue of its attestation of the OG, but it has no special, post-OG relationship to Pal. G:L does demonstrate some post-OG revision that correlates with the text of Pal, but also goes beyond it. The OL corroborates these G:L readings. G:Acx is not an independent witness to the OG. The OG Vorlage differs from both the MT and Pal. The latter two also disagree with each other and, thus, there is evidence of three text types. The OG, however, also shares a significant number of readings with Pal. The OG, thus, has a relationship with Pal that extends beyond the mutual contact with the original text that is still present in all three text types despite their many independent departures from it.⁸⁹

Ulrich and Nysse have shown, unquestionably, the convergence of other ancient witnesses against MT Samuel. They, as Cross their Doctor Father, underestimated the independent readings of 4QSam^a, and they overestimated the affinity between 4QSam^a and the Greek translation (see above), but overall their conclusions are sound.

1.3.3 Versions of Chronicles

Compared to Samuel, the textual traditions of Chronicles are homogeneous. A possible explanation for this phenomenon is offered in 2.3.2.1. The Masoretic Text of

⁸⁹ Nysse 1984; cf. Nysse 1980. Important studies focusing on LXX 1 Samuel are Brock 1996; Taylor 1992.

Chronicles is 'fairly well preserved', with the frequently discussed exceptions of numbers and proper names.⁹⁰ Only one small fragment of Chronicles was discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls, 4QChr/4Q118, containing portions of 2 Chron. 28.27-29.3 with slight variations from the MT.⁹¹ It is unclear whether the virtual absence of the book of Chronicles among the Dead Sea Scrolls is by accident or design, perhaps related to the book's deficient authoritativeness or its focus on Jerusalem and the Temple.⁹² The Greek translation of Chronicles (*Paraleipomena*) is 'literal' and 'non-expansionistic' compared with MT Chronicles.⁹³ It often has readings which are considered preferable to those of the MT, and which agree with MT and/or LXX Samuel–Kings against MT Chronicles. According to Gerleman, the genealogies and lists of names in LXX 1 Chronicles 1–9 show greater resemblance to the Samaritan Pentateuch than to the MT.⁹⁴ Allen undertook a thorough study in which he showed that the OG is best preserved in his group 4 (G) which includes B, c₂ and S, but the latter is extent only for 1 Chron. 9.27-19.17.⁹⁵ His other three manuscript groups, group 1 (L or Lucianic; principally be₂)⁹⁶, group 2 (R; principally dpqtz) and group 3 (O or Hexaplaric; principally ANaceghn), are revisions toward the MT. Allen thinks Greek Chronicles has absorbed varying amounts of contamination from parallel texts in Samuel–Kings.⁹⁷ Furthermore, he believes *MT*

⁹⁰ On the basis of these S. Davidson 1862: II, 108 says 'We believe that the text *is* more corrupt than that of any other sacred book' (cf. 108-115). Payne 1978, 1979 give some attention to this issue, and more recently, Klein 1997 gives a short review of numbers over 1,000 in Chronicles for the purpose of determining the meaning of אֶלֶף. The present writer has investigated all numbers with מאות/מאה and/or אלפים/אלף in MT 1 Samuel 31–2 Samuel, 1–2 Kings, and 1 Chronicles 10–2 Chronicles 36. The results of this analysis must be given elsewhere. In any case, S. Davidson overstates the facts.

⁹¹ Treballe Barrera 2000a; cf. Abegg, Flint and Ulrich 1999: 632-633; Treballe Barrera 1992b, 2000b.

⁹² D. D. Swanson 1995 shows that the Temple Scroll used Chronicles as a source. However, since the Scroll is probably not a Qumran sectarian document, but rather, predates the community, it cannot be used as proof that Chronicles was in fact more favoured in the community.

⁹³ Klein 1992: 995; Treballe Barrera 2000b. Jellicoe 1968: 290-294 is inaccurate.

⁹⁴ Gerleman 1948.

⁹⁵ Allen 1974.

⁹⁶ That is, 19 (b'), 93 (e₂), 108 (b). Similarly, Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz 1996.

⁹⁷ Allen 1974: I, 26-30, 175-217; cf. Gerleman 1946; Rehm 1937.

Chronicles has undergone assimilation to Samuel–Kings in *several* instances: 1 Chron. 6.46 (LXX 6.61); 16.35; 2 Chron. 6.27; 27.8.⁹⁸

The perennial issue regarding Chronicles is the *Vorlage* of the book. As stated already, the present writer is not certain that Chronicles' principal *Vorlage* was Samuel–Kings, but given that this is the consensus, it is necessary to reiterate that the textform of the book's *Vorlage* was certainly not proto-MT Samuel–Kings. Earlier scholars, and still some, assumed that the Chronicler used a text much like that reflected in MT Samuel–Kings, and attributed the differences between the two to the composer's rewriting. A dramatic change in thought has come about in the past half century. Recent commentaries and many other publications on Chronicles acknowledge that the textform of Chronicles' *Vorlage* was not identical to the text found in MT Samuel–Kings.⁹⁹ This view was forcefully championed by Cross from the early 1950s on the heels of the Qumran discoveries, and two subsequent Harvard theses on Samuel¹⁰⁰ and three on Chronicles¹⁰¹ have sustained his thesis. Many others give corroborative evidence, and the cumulative result of these studies is that it is unacceptable to 'discredit' the Chronicler with many (supposedly tendentious) deviations from his *Vorlage*.

1.4 Summary of Chapter one

This chapter surveys three areas of research related to Samuel and Chronicles: (1) the history of research and current views on the composition of these books; (2) the history of research on the story of David's ark transfer in Samuel and Chronicles, and the

⁹⁸ Allen 1974: I, 217–218; cf. this writer's discussions in 3.1.2.3, 3.1.5.2, 3.1.6.2, 4.1.2.1, 5.1.1.1, 5.1.3.5, 5.1.3.7.

⁹⁹ This view is so pervasive that it hardly requires validation, but nonetheless: Japhet 1993: 28–29; Williamson 1982: 2–3.

¹⁰⁰ Nysse 1984; Ulrich 1978.

¹⁰¹ Klein 1966; Lemke 1963; McKenzie 1984. McKenzie goes further, arguing that the original version of Chronicles was based on Dtr¹ (his first or pre-exilic or Josianic edition of the DH), but his thesis is questionable (Williamson 1987).

meaning of each narrative in its own context; and (3) the history of research on the textual witnesses to Samuel and Chronicles, with particular emphasis on the Greek translations, and in the case of Samuel, on the Dead Sea Scrolls. This survey establishes the context for the investigation as a whole. The following conclusions are significant.

First, scholarship increasingly attributes more of Samuel to Deuteronomistic editors and less of the book to pre-existing material which was later incorporated into the book. Historically, however, scholars have discerned relatively little Deuteronomistic intervention in Samuel. The current trend is to move from sources to composition. Many practitioners of narrative criticism treat the book as a unified whole. Consequently, it is appropriate to ponder once again the literary history of the book of Samuel, and to reconsider the matter in light of fresh evidence—or at least with a fresh view on relatively new evidence.

Second, MT Samuel frequently diverges from other witnesses to the book, especially the Greek translation and the fragments preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is impossible to defend the view that Chronicles was based on proto-MT Samuel, if in fact Chronicles was even based on Samuel–Kings in the so-called DH. Furthermore, this thesis corroborates the results of Ulrich and Nysse, who identify many belated readings in MT Samuel. Consequently, it is problematic and wrong to use LXX Samuel, or 4QSam^a, or Chronicles, solely to emend MT Samuel. MT Samuel is not simply the result of scribal carelessness.

Third, many recognise that 2 Samuel 6 is sated with textual and linguistic problems. It is remarkable, however, that scholarship has failed to find any significant connection between MT's condition and the nature of the language and portrayals in 2 Samuel 6. Furthermore, the divergence between the witnesses in this chapter and elsewhere has not been factored into this equation. Ulrich and Nysse, for example,

demonstrate the secondary nature of many readings in MT 2 Samuel 6, but neither they nor others seek to connect the diverse phenomena just described. *Why* is the *total situation* such as it is? This thesis argues an answer to this question. The text and sense of 2 Samuel 6 are the result of successive interventions by editors as they sought to relate the story of David's transfer of the ark to their needs or the needs of their communities. 2 Samuel 6 speaks about David, and his relationship to both the deity and the former monarch. These are not 'light' topics; thus the state and significance of MT 2 Samuel 6 are not uncomplicated. By focusing on the Chronicler as *the* reshapener of the story, scholars fail to perceive revisers' heavy hands in Samuel.

CHAPTER TWO

Approaches: Synchronic, Diachronic, Textual-Exegetical

2.0 Introduction

This chapter surveys issues related to synchronic and diachronic approaches to the books of Samuel and Chronicles and suggests that the impasse between these competing approaches to the interpretation of these books, especially Samuel, may be resolved by the textual-exegetical approach. By combining textual and literary criticism in the analysis of the stories about David and Saul, and especially 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16, the interpreter is enabled to roll back the process of formation of the texts and stories.

2.1 Synchronic Approach: Reading the Stories about David and Saul in a Biblical Context

Outside Samuel and Chronicles, the Bible refers *by name* to Israel's first monarch, Saul, only in Isa. 10.29 and in the headings to five Psalms (18, 52, 54, 57, 59). He is a character in Samuel and Chronicles in the following passages and blocks of material:

–	1 Chron. 5.10
Focus falls on Saul and his family throughout: 1 Samuel 9–2 Samuel 4	Saul's lineage and death are reported in: 1 Chron. 8.33; 9.39; 10.2-8, 11-12
2 Sam. 5.2	1 Chron. 11.2
–	1 Chron. 12.1-2, 20, 24, 30
2 Sam. 6.16, 20, 23	1 Chron. 13.3; 15.29
2 Sam. 7.15; 9.1-3, 6-7, 9; 12.7; 16.5, 8; 19.18, 25; 21.1-2, 4, 6-8, 11-14; 22.1	–
–	1 Chron. 26.28

By and large Samuel and Chronicles sketch a positive portrait of David *in comparison* with Saul.¹⁰² Both books offer a highly negative appraisal of the latter—of both his character and his deeds—and explicitly and implicitly in the books' structures, themes and language. See 1.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3. Chronicles. The only non-negative reference to Saul is 1 Chron. 26.28, and many rightly question the literary integrity of this verse. Elsewhere, Saul, 'the non-cultic king', is simply a foil for David.¹⁰³ Samuel. 'The legitimacy of David, an outsider/insider, over against Saul's house is a fundamental theme in the Samuel narrative'.¹⁰⁴ The narrative in 1 Samuel 16–2 Samuel 5 is often described as an apology for David against the external threat to his kingship posed by Saul's house. For example, the narrative develops three themes for the purpose of showing that David did not usurp the throne of Saul: (1) Saul's animosity, (2) David's

¹⁰² This does not mean that either book presents David as an idealised hero. This is sometimes overstated for Chronicles, but see Japhet 1997: 473-478; 1993: 48; Williamson 1982: 118. The presentation of David in Samuel is complex (Steussy 1999: 40-91). Not everybody, of course, takes such a positive view, e.g., Polzin 1989, 1993. As observed in 1.1, David spends more time clashing with and fleeing from Saul (1 Samuel 18–29) and Absalom (2 Samuel 13–19) than he does seated on the throne. In addition to some interpretations of 2 Samuel 6 and 24 (1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 and 21), the obvious exception to David's positive portrait in Samuel is the story about David, Bathsheba and Uriah in 2 Samuel 10–12. This material, however, may have been inserted secondarily in Samuel and in this particular narrative location, precisely in order to challenge a mostly positive portrayal of David in Samuel. See the note regarding 2 Samuel 10–12 in 1.2.2 (in the discussion of 2 Samuel 6 and 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18). In this writer's opinion, the tension between a mostly positive and slightly negative appraisal of David's character and kingship is due more to recurrent re-interpretations, adjustments and supplements rather than to a one-time wholly conceived history of David.

¹⁰³ Duke 1990: 56-59; Riley 1993: 39-53.

¹⁰⁴ Flanagan 1992: 963; cf. Amit 2000: 169-178; Brettler 1995: 91-111; 1996.

non-aggression, and (3) David's innocence.¹⁰⁵ An important theme in Samuel is the characterisation of Saul and David vis-à-vis their military aptness against the Philistines, and others such as the Amalekites, Ammonites, Arameans, Edomites and Moabites. For example: Yahweh chooses Saul that he might deliver Israel from the Philistines (1 Sam. 9.16), yet Saul is incapable against them, unlike Jonathan and unlike David, and his end finally comes by their hands (1 Samuel 31). David is explicitly recognised for his victories over the Philistines during Saul's reign (1 Sam. 18.6, 30; 19.5; 21.12; 29.5), and upon assuming the kingship, he effectively eliminates the Philistine threat (2 Sam. 5.17-25; cf. 19.9), the purpose for which Yahweh chooses him too (2 Sam. 3.18). In spite of similar evaluations in 1 Sam. 14.47-48 and 2 Sam. 8.10b-12, the book makes clear that David rather than Saul removed the Philistine reproach from Israel (cf. *MT* 1 Sam. 17.26).

Research has shown that the pro-David/anti-Saul polemic in 1 Samuel 16–2 Samuel 5 extends outside this corpus of material, even into 'earlier' and 'later' books, and far beyond a hypothetical tenth century BCE setting. The fact that David's kingship did not immediately eclipse the influence and memory of the Saulide dynasty is at least suggested by 2 Sam. 3.1.

(1) Saul and Samuel, in 1 Samuel 1–15. Samuel is somewhat concerned to show the failures of Saul independent from and antedating his relationship with David (1 Samuel 9–15). David did not cause Saul's failure; rather, Saul disqualified himself before David came on the scene. It has been argued that the link between the traditions concerning Saul and the HDR, namely 1 Samuel 15, is a secondary insertion by an editor with a strong pro-Davidic bias, the effect of whose intervention was to hasten the fall of Saul in order to make way for the kingship of David.¹⁰⁶ Some argue that an original

¹⁰⁵ McCarter 1980b; Whitelam 1984.

¹⁰⁶ Foresti 1984.

history of Saul in 1 Samuel 9–15 was rewritten as an anti-Saul story¹⁰⁷, and some argue that the birth narrative in 1 Samuel 1 originally spoke of Saul, but that it too was subjected to pro-Davidic editing.¹⁰⁸

(2) Saul and Absalom, in 1 Samuel 16–31 and 2 Samuel 13–20. Few remark on the literary links between the stories of David and Saul and the stories of David and Absalom. The links between 2 Samuel 2–4 and 2 Samuel 9–20 are developed by Gunn, McKenzie and Van Seters, among others.¹⁰⁹ However, the connections which these observe at the peripheries of the HDR and SN/CH actually lie closer to their centres. Ho develops many affinities¹¹⁰, and this writer summarises additional ones in appendix 5. In summary, it is suggested that Saul, Nabal and Absalom are types of one another, each opposed to David. Absalom is a second Saul. Thus both are pitted against David, as external and internal threats to his throne. They are 'negatives' of David.

(3) Saul and Samson, in 1 Samuel 16–31 and Judges 13–16. To begin, observe that MT and LXX 1 Sam. 12.11 speak of Jerubaal, Bedan (MT)/Barak (LXX), Jephthah and Samuel. In spite of 'Samson' rather than 'Samuel' in the NRSV¹¹¹, Samson is never mentioned outside the book of Judges. Brooks argues that these stories are intimately related.¹¹² In particular, Saul's birth story is incorporated into that of Samuel (see above). When the image of Samuel is put to one side, it becomes clear that Saul's image closely parallels that of Samson in that they share not only a similar Nazirite birth, but also their heroic characters. In Brooks' opinion, the *pro-Saul* author could not openly write the true story of Saul; instead he camouflaged it behind the heroic image of Samson. The writer expands on Brooks' thesis in appendix 5. In short, a number of conceptual and linguistic

¹⁰⁷ J. M. Miller 1974.

¹⁰⁸ Brettler 1995: 109; 1996: 89-90; 1997: 602-603. He cites Hylander 1932: 11-39.

¹⁰⁹ Gunn 1978: 65-84; McKenzie 2000; Van Seters 1983: 281-285; 2000.

¹¹⁰ Ho 1994: 24-28, 131-188.

¹¹¹ This translation is presumably based on the reading in the Greek cursives 19 (b'), 29 (b₂) and 376 (c).

¹¹² Brooks 1996.

elements suggest that Brooks' association of Saul with Samson merits further consideration. It is possible and perhaps better, however, to read the Samson story as anti-rather than pro-Saul.

(4) Saul and Gibeah, in 1 Samuel 16–31, and in Judges 19–20. David has his origin in Bethlehem in Judah (1 Samuel 16–17) and is associated with Hebron in Judah during his early kingship (2 Samuel 2–5).¹¹³ Saul is a Benjaminite closely attached to Gibeah (1 Sam. 10.5, 10, 26; 11.4; 13.2, 15; 14.2, 16; 15.34; 22.6; 23.19; 26.1, 3; *MT* 2 Sam. 21.6)¹¹⁴ and in a few cases to Geba (1 Sam. 13.3, 16; 14.5).¹¹⁵ Isa. 10.29 associates Saul with both these places. Conversely, Greek Samuel associates Saul with Gibeon in 2 Sam. 21.6, as do the genealogies in *MT/LXX* 1 Chron. 8.29–40 (esp. 29, 33) and 9.35–44 (esp. 35, 39). In addition, Gibeon is a significant locale related to Saul's affiliates or deeds in 2 Sam. 2.12–13, 16, 24; 3.30; 20.8; 21.1–4, 9, and it is also the site of a significant במה related to Solomon in 1 Kgs. 3.4–5; 9.2 // 2 Chron. 1.3, 13 (cf. 1 Chron. 16.39; 21.29). Based on these passages, and following Wellhausen¹¹⁶, some argue that Saul's home was *really* Gibeon rather than Gibeah.¹¹⁷ However, P. M. Arnold argues against a historical association of Saul with Gibeon¹¹⁸, and Walters points out that Saul is the only person in the Chronicler's genealogies unlinked to one of Jacob's twelve sons. He is connected instead with Gibeon, a city which typifies Canaanite religious and political traditions. He is therefore unsuitable to be king, and the future belongs to David and a revived Davidic

¹¹³ Milgrom 1989: 392, citing Levenson 1978, suggests that the magnification of Caleb in the early tradition (Numbers, Joshua–Judges) reflects and legitimates David's coronation in Hebron (the home of the Calebites) as king of Judah.

¹¹⁴ Gibeah occurs elsewhere in 2 Sam. 2.24–25; 6.3–4; 23.29. See 3.1.2.3.

¹¹⁵ Geba occurs elsewhere in 2 Sam. 5.25. See 3.1.2.3.

¹¹⁶ Wellhausen 1871: 209.

¹¹⁷ Ahlström 1984; Blenkinsopp 1969, 1972, 1974; Demsky 1973; Edelman 1984, 1988, 1991, 1992, 2001, 2003; Schunck 1963; van der Toorn 1993.

¹¹⁸ P. M. Arnold 1990.

state.¹¹⁹ Consequently, the association of Saul with Gibeon in Chronicles is merely a literary construct.¹²⁰ Whatever the case may be, it is sufficient to observe that *MT* Samuel repeatedly links Saul to גבעה and occasionally to גבע but never to גבעון. As for the association of Saul with Gibeah and Geba, both locations were essentially synonymous geographically, and the similar orthography has resulted in confusion in the literature as illustrated in Judges 20 and 1 Samuel 13–14.¹²¹ Is there further significance in the link between Saul and Gibeah? Some argue that Samuel's story about Saul should be read in light of the story of the Levite and his concubine in Judges 19–20 (and then in light of Genesis 19) which entails a hidden anti-Saul polemic.¹²²

(5) Saul in the Writings (outside Chronicles). Amit and Brettler suggest that the introduction of Mordecai as the 'son of Jair son of Shimei son of Kish, a Benjaminite' in Esth. 2.5 reflects positively on Saul, whose descendant is the hero of the story.¹²³ Ackroyd, Brettler and Flanagan think the preservation of the genealogy of Saul in 1 Chron. 8.29-40 and 9.35-44 makes a similar point.¹²⁴ Finally, Brettler suggests that Isa. 55.3 and indeed Deutero-Isaiah as a whole should remind us that not everyone in exilic and post-exilic Israel had messianic expectations of the house of David.¹²⁵

(6) Saul in post-biblical literature. Brettler traces the pro-Saul ideology described above into post-biblical literature.¹²⁶

¹¹⁹ Gibeon is significant elsewhere only in Joshua 9–10, where the Gibeonites are disparaged.

¹²⁰ Walters 1991.

¹²¹ P. M. Arnold 1990, 1992a, 1992b, 1992c; Demsky 1973; Langston 1998: 83-92; J. M. Miller 1975. P. M. Arnold argues that once Gibeah fell under Judean political control and linguistic influence, its name changed from Gibeah to Geba.

¹²² Amit 1994, 1999, 2000, 2003; Brettler 1989, 2002; Jüngling 1981; Lasine 1984; O'Connell 1996. Dragga 1987 builds his case for the failure of Saul on the list of judges mentioned in 1 Samuel 11.

¹²³ Amit 2000: 185; Brettler 1995: 110. This view is also argued in Abramsky 1983, 1984.

¹²⁴ Ackroyd 1973: 42; Brettler 1989: 423-425; 1992a: 106; 1992c: 689; 1995: 110; Flanagan 1982: 25; 1983: 366. Williamson 1982: 93 rejects this view. Flanagan 1988: 343-347 gives genealogical charts of the Davidic and Saulide lines.

¹²⁵ Brettler 1995: 110, who cites Eissfeldt 1962.

¹²⁶ Brettler 1995: 110-111.

This survey shows that a pro-David/anti-Saul polemic lies behind all of Samuel, figures in Judges, which serves as a preface to Samuel, moves beyond these compositions into the Writings, and continues in post-biblical literature. Furthermore, Brettler and others show that an anti-David/pro-Saul polemic is recognisable in more restricted portions of biblical and post-biblical literature.¹²⁷ It is reasonable to conclude that '(house of) David versus (house of) Saul' and/or 'Judah versus Benjamin' were important motifs in the exilic, post-exilic and post-biblical chapters of Israelite literature and history, long after a hypothetical tenth century BCE setting for the historical figures. The existence of this ideological battle in ancient Israel is undeniable, although its full range and dynamics are not entirely clear.¹²⁸ A major goal of this thesis is to demonstrate that many details in the story of the ark in MT 2 Samuel 6 are related to the aforementioned pro-David/anti-Saul polemic. Most believe this polemic is elevated in Chronicles vis-à-vis 2 Samuel 6, with the exception of 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23, by the insertion of 1 Chron. 13.3 and the retention of 15.29. However, it has gone unnoticed that many details outside the Michal material in MT 2 Samuel 6 are secondary and aimed at advancing the contrast between King David and Saul.

¹²⁷ It is likely that a systematic study of this topic will locate additional examples of the vitality of '(house of) David versus (house of) Saul' and/or 'Judah versus Benjamin' in biblical and post-biblical literature, such as the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls, Josephus, Targumim, Mishnah, Tosefta, Talmud and Midrashim.

¹²⁸ Scholarship is gradually revealing the importance of the region of Benjamin in the Babylonian and Persian periods, which may provide an historical basis for the composition and/or revision of many biblical texts. On the archaeology and history of Benjamin in these periods see Lipschits 1999; Stern 2001: 321-323, 431-434; Zorn 1997. On biblical literature see Amit 2000: 184-188; 2003; Edelman 2001, 2003. Also see the helpful discussion in Langston 1998. He examines Benjaminite cult sites, designated by *במה*, *גבעה* or *רמה*, and concludes with a helpful discussion of cultic and political implications of Benjamin's cultic prominence (180-200). His comments on David's transfer of the ark in 2 Samuel 6 are pertinent. In his view, '[t]he account serves to symbolize the divine rejection of Benjaminite cultic leadership in favor of Levitical control', and the figure of Michal functions as a symbol of Benjamin (192-194). He concludes his book saying: 'Perhaps during the time of the exile and the early days of the restoration, rumblings of support for the Benjaminites had resumed, thereby necessitating a re-affirmation of the Levites and David. If so, the conflict between Levi and Benjamin had re-surfaced'.

2.2 Diachronic Approach: Discerning Literary Layers in Stories about David and Saul

Scholars use the following criteria for discerning sources and editorial layers in Samuel and the DH.

- **Oppositions:** contradictions, inconsistencies or incongruities, tensions in a passage or between passages.
- **Variations:** in style, grammar, vocabulary (e.g., divine appellation), perspective or viewpoint, that is, ideology or religious outlook (e.g., prophetic, legal, cultic).
- **Repetitions:** conflation or duplications of words, phrases or passages; includes terminology such as doublet, duplicate, double reading, double narrative, *lectio duplex*, conflate reading, alternative reading, synonymous reading, recapitulation, resumptive repetition, *repetición de engarce*, reprise, *Wiederaufnahme*, etc.
- **Insertions:** abrupt interruptions and explanations (e.g., explanatory glosses) which disrupt the logic, flow, and continuity of a narrative.
- **Comparisons:** noticeable differences in the compilation and redaction of parallel accounts (e.g., Samuel–Kings // Chronicles).

The ensuing remarks are not comprehensive.

First, it is well known that the application of these criteria has resulted in diverse and perhaps irreconcilable views concerning the literary makeup of Samuel¹²⁹ and the compositional layers of the DH.¹³⁰ This is illustrated by a comparison of the views held by adherents to the 'Göttingen School' with the views held by advocates of the 'Harvard School'.

Second, the aforementioned situation results from scholars' dependence on subjective criteria for the demarcation of literary layers, namely, the discernment of different themes, interests or perspectives, both positive and negative. For example, the division between positive and negative, pro- and anti-, prophetic and nomistic, judgment and blessing, and so on, depends heavily on the conceptualisation of the interpreter; also,

¹²⁹ McCarter 1994.

¹³⁰ McKenzie 1992.

the contrasted ideas are not necessarily mutually exclusive in a single literary stratum. 'The philologist ought not to maximize for his text an expectation of consistency and unflawed esthetics'.¹³¹

Third, practitioners of 'new literary criticism' or 'narrative criticism' have produced many synchronic or holistic or final-form readings of biblical texts. These scholars, due to dogmatic or pragmatic reasons, reject the diachronic approach and the above criteria for discerning sources and editorial layers. The outcome is the 'disappearing redactor' phenomenon.¹³²

Fourth, the gap between adherents to the diachronic and synchronic approaches and methodologies continues to increase.¹³³ Some respond to this impasse by reassessing, reaffirming and sometimes modifying source- and redaction-critical methodologies. This is illustrated in investigations which find analogies or models in non-biblical literature for diachrony in biblical texts.¹³⁴ Others focus on the usefulness of uniting the diachronic and synchronic approaches.¹³⁵ For example, Auld and Conroy affirm the diachronic and synchronic approaches and argue that textual criticism can serve as a pivot-point between them.¹³⁶ This tactic is promising. The versional evidence substantiates the validity of the diachronic approach—*there are* earlier and later forms of biblical texts and editions of biblical stories—and scholars can use this evidence to discern literary origins and developments—developments in the versions whose special features, and the reasons for them, may be perceived and appreciated through holistic or final-form readings.

¹³¹ Tsevat 1980: 203.

¹³² J. Barton 1984: 57; cf. 56-58.

¹³³ Gillingham 1998; Haynes and McKenzie 1993.

¹³⁴ Kaufman 1982; Tigay 1975, 1985; Tertel 1994.

¹³⁵ De Moor 1995. Berges 1989 and Talstra 1993 make complementary use of synchronic and diachronic methods.

¹³⁶ Auld 1996: 167; 1999a: 126; Conroy 1996: 218.

2.3 Textual-Exegetical Approach: Combining Textual and Literary Criticism in an Analysis of the Stories about David and Saul

2.3.1 Rise, Decline, Rebirth

Goshen-Gottstein's classic essay 'The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: Rise, Decline, Rebirth' (1983) chronicles the place of textual criticism in biblical studies over a period of five centuries. His survey begins in the sixteenth century, when textual criticism formed the background of the critical-exegetical endeavour. However, he then shows that beginning in the late eighteenth century the undertaking of large research and publication projects, such as Kennicott's collations, led to sub-specialisation, with the result that textual criticism became slowly divorced from other fields of critical inquiry. There were occasional exceptions during this period, such as Cornill's *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (1886), de Lagarde's *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (1863), and Wellhausen's *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht* (1871). Nevertheless, the time around 1950 signifies for Goshen-Gottstein the beginning of what may be looked upon as a new stage in the history of textual criticism.¹³⁷ Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, a handful of scholars has returned to text-critical exegesis or the textual-exegetical endeavour.

Trebolle Barrera is a key figure among those taking this approach to biblical literature.¹³⁸ Auld is another.¹³⁹ In a much briefer and more focused historical sketch than Goshen-Gottstein's, Trebolle Barrera describes the role of textual criticism in

¹³⁷ Also Cross 1995: 183.

¹³⁸ He develops a textual-exegetical methodology in three monographs on Samuel and Kings: Trebolle Barrera 1980: 1-44, esp. 27-44; 1984b: 89-97; 1989a: 13-39. Unfortunately, most are unfamiliar with these major contributions. Shorter applications of his methodology are Trebolle Barrera 1982, 1984a, 1998: 381-387. Additional contributions related to the history of redaction of passages in Samuel are Trebolle Barrera 1979, 1981, 1989b, 1990. Trebolle Barrera 1986a interacts with McCarter and Trebolle Barrera 1986b with Barthélemy and Pisano.

¹³⁹ Other significant names in this regard are Barthélemy, Bogaert, Cross, Fernández Marcos, Floss, Gooding, Knoppers, van der Kooij, Lust, McKenzie, Person, Pisano, Rofé, Rösel, Schenker, Stipp, Talmon, Z. Talshir, Tov and Ulrich.

investigations of the DH since Noth's *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (1943) and he describes an alternative approach to the evidence.

Research on the books of Kings has been dominated in these last decades by the work of M. Noth on the Deuteronomistic *redaction*. His masterpiece opened up new paths and proposed new models of research. After every masterpiece, however, research sooner or later becomes 'scholasticized' and confines itself tamely to the lines traced by the master. Furthermore, the impact of a masterpiece tends either to marginalize earlier paths of research or to close them off entirely. Thus in the work of Noth and his disciples very little importance has been given to the contributions to be drawn from the versions (esp. the LXX and the VL) for *recension* history and text history of the books of the Bible. In the books of Kings these versions offer many important variant readings with respect to the MT. Noth's work in 1943 coincided with a generalized 'return to the MT' movement. At that time the Greek version came to be considered mostly as a targum or as a *midrashic* paraphrase of the Hebrew. J. W. Wevers at mid-century and more recently D. W. Gooding and R. P. Gordon developed this line of research by studying the 'principles of exegesis' underlying the Greek version of Kings and the midrashic elements it contains.

If the early decades of this century were characterized by both the use and abuse of conjecturally restoring the 'primitive text' (*Urtext*) by choosing among the many variants found in the versions, these last decades have seen the analogous abuse of conjecturing, on literary grounds, what was the 'primitive form' (*Urform*), and this on the basis of the Massoretic text alone. Consequently, if on the one hand the history of the tradition and redaction of Kings (10th-5th century BC) now appears excessively complicated, on the other hand we are content with a very simple history of the transmission of the text. In the long span stretching from the 5th century BC up to the medieval Massoretes, it is currently assumed that there existed but a simple and direct line of textual transmission in the Hebrew (Noth); the variants of the versions are considered to be merely tendentious deviations from a uniform Hebrew text.

The study of the biblical MSS of Qumran, in particular of 4QSam^{a,b,c}, has facilitated a new understanding of the parallel history and parallel evolution of the Hebrew and Greek texts of Samuel-Kings. This new knowledge creates the need for an interdisciplinary dialogue between the practitioners of redaction history (Noth and his school) and those of the study of the transmission and recension of the text (e.g., W. F. Albright, F. M. Cross, D. Barthélemy, etc.).

In such a dialogue it will be accepted that many of the variants in the versions do not represent isolated phenomena or occasional acts of negligence on the part of the translators and/or copyists. Rather, they represent complete patterns all their own which correspond to different types of text that once existed in the Hebrew tradition. It will also be accepted that the plurality of textual types can even reflect different stages in the earlier process of the redaction and editing of the text.¹⁴⁰

¹⁴⁰ Treballe Barrera 1982: 12-13.

The keystone of his methodology is the use of text-critical controls on redactional arguments in the DH, for the reason that

methodologically speaking ... an argument based on the formal aspects of a given text should take precedence over an argument based on its possible 'tendencies'. It also comes first in order as one applies the several critical methods. *Tendenzkritik* is very much exposed to the fantasies and the biases of each exegete.¹⁴¹

Auld and Person make similar claims.¹⁴² *Formal or external evidence/criteria are objectively superior to non-formal or internal evidence/criteria for discerning diachronic developments in biblical texts.* The analysis of biblical texts should not end here, but this is the best departure point. The following sections elaborate on the underpinnings and tactics of the textual-exegetical endeavour.

2.3.2 Concepts and Methodology

2.3.2.1 From Pluriformity to Uniformity

The text of the Bible did not change substantially during the Talmudic and Masoretic periods of activity: authoritative readings were chosen and annotated in cases of variants; attempts were made to implement a unitary orthography; and signs for vocalisation and accentuation were added. However, textual fluidity and pluriformity characterised the Bible prior to the end of the first or early in the second century CE. These phenomena have analogies in other ancient literature, and they are corroborated by:

- Repetitions of words, phrases, passages *and books* (Samuel–Kings // Chronicles) in the received text and other versions of the Bible, which may also point toward conflicting literary and historical traditions.¹⁴³ See 2.2.
- Small and large scale variations from the received text in the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the versions of the Septuagint, and elsewhere. Discussions of double and successive literary editions will follow.

¹⁴¹ Treballe Barrera 1982: 25.

¹⁴² Auld 1993: 5–6; Person 2002: 17–24.

¹⁴³ Nahkola 2001; Treballe Barrera 1992a.

- Variations from the received text in extra-biblical citations, in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, New Testament, and rabbinic and patristic literature.
- Origen's description and treatment of disagreements between biblical texts and attempts by him and others to bring the Septuagint in line with the received text.
- Rabbinic traditions about textual disorder and the activities of the *sopherim* ('the authorised revisers of the text'¹⁴⁴) and the Masoretes.

The concepts of textual fluidity and pluriformity are self-evident and now widely embraced.¹⁴⁵ Among others, Barthélemy, Childs, Cross, Goshen-Gottstein, Sanders, Skehan, Talmon, Tov, Trebelle Barrera, and Ulrich, have published widely on these topics.¹⁴⁶ For example, Ulrich says 'The Scriptures were pluriform (as were Judaism and Christianity) until at least 70 C.E., probably until 100, and quite possibly as late as 135 or beyond'.¹⁴⁷ It was not until then that the rabbis selected one text ('the proto-MT') from among several alternative texts of each book of the Bible, and established it as the normative or authoritative text of that book ('the *textus receptus*'), thus eliminating variant lines of tradition in normative Judaism. *The Bible was pluriform by process; it was made uniform by selection.*

The four hundred year 'pre-stabilisation phase' (ca. 300 BCE–100 CE) was a period of productive (not *just* reproductive) work by scribes and editors, during which many intentional (not *just* unintentional) changes were made. The biblical texts and

¹⁴⁴ Ginsburg 1897: 307.

¹⁴⁵ First, Sanders 1992: 848 points out that there is a pervasive tendency to deny these phenomena within Jewish and Christian religious communities and confessional groups. This trend is related to beliefs about the inerrancy and infallibility of the sacred text and, in this writer's opinion, is deeply embedded in the psychological preference for the 'comfort and simplicity' of the received text over the 'discomfort and complexity' of varied and competing texts. Brotzman 1994: 17-24 is an illustration. Second, Knoppers 2000: 126 makes the point that 'The differences between these various textual witnesses suggest a certain instability and history of development within the text before the Common Era. In short, ignoring or defying evidence for diachronic development in the Deuteronomistic History can lead to superficial or forced arguments for synchronic unity'.

¹⁴⁶ The sole attempt to refute this position is van der Woude 1992 (cf. 1995), and van der Kooij 2002 adds his support. Their arguments are significant, but insufficient to rebut the consensus view (Ulrich 2002; cf. Lim 2001).

¹⁴⁷ Ulrich 1999: 31.

stories were fluid and pluriform, changing and growing continually, dynamically and organically.¹⁴⁸ The 'transformation' of biblical texts and stories is discussed below.

Prior to the twentieth century mid-point scholars affirmed, to some extent, the fluidity and pluriformity of 'the biblical text'. In addition, they recognised the *likelihood* of variant editions *in Hebrew* of some biblical books. The discovery of biblical scrolls beginning in 1947 in the region of the Dead Sea transformed scholarly opinion on both issues. In its 'pre-stabilisation phase' the biblical text(s) was far more fluid and pluriform than previously imagined, and the possibility of variant editions of biblical books in Hebrew was made reality. Scholars must now contend with 'an array of variant literary editions of virtually all the books of the scriptures'.¹⁴⁹ These facts call for the complete rewriting of the history of development of the biblical 'text'.

This is not the place to present and critique the principal views on the history of development of the biblical 'text'. In short, Cross argues for a theory of local texts, Talmon argues for a theory of multiple pristine editions, Tov argues for a theory of textual variety, and Ulrich argues for a theory of successive literary editions.¹⁵⁰ Most scholars find Cross' local texts theory unsatisfactory since the extant textforms and textual phenomena cannot be exclusively situated in a Palestinian, Egyptian or Babylonian setting. In this writer's view, Ulrich's theory of successive literary editions provides an accommodating framework for investigating textual and literary developments within particular books of the Bible.¹⁵¹ He describes the theory this way:

The heart of the theory is that the main lines in the picture of the history of the biblical text are formed by the deliberate activity of a series of creative scribes who, one after another in different eras for different reasons, produced the new literary editions of the books (or passages) of the Bible. ... The fundamental principle guiding this proposal is that the Scriptures, from shadowy beginnings to

¹⁴⁸ Lim 1997: 95; Sæbø 1998: 46; Trebolle Barrera 1980: 371; Würthwein 1979: 108, 110.

¹⁴⁹ Ulrich 2000: 128.

¹⁵⁰ VanderKam and Flint 2002: 140-147 is a recent 'non-partisan' survey.

¹⁵¹ Ulrich 1999 collects many relevant essays.

the final, perhaps abrupt, freezing point of the Masoretic tradition, arose and evolved through a process of organic development. The major lines of that development are characterized by the intentional, creative work of authors or tradents who produced new, revised editions of the traditional form of a book or passage. New *Zeitgeisten* or events, new problems or possibilities, were probably the catalysts for new such editions. This happened repeatedly for all books of the Bible, from the earliest formulations of their sources, until the threats to the continued life of Judaism itself—the Roman destruction and the Christian crisis in the late first or early second century CE—probably brought the process of development to an abrupt cutoff.¹⁵²

Ulrich also describes three steps for studying these variant literary editions.¹⁵³

The new theories regarding the developmental history of the biblical 'text' force the reconsideration of the concept of 'the original text' and of the goal of textual criticism. First, was there a single exemplar or archetype or prototype or Ur-text of each book of the Bible? It is not an overstatement to say that most follow de Lagarde's belief in the existence of 'the original text' of each biblical book. Scholars such as Greenberg and Talmon, who think in terms of parallel or divergent or irreducible pristine texts, are few in number. Nevertheless, the search for 'the original text' depends in large part on how one defines the phrase. Ulrich gives eight possible meanings, ranging from "'the original text" of the *source* incorporated by an early author or tradent', to "'the original text" as the original or superior form of the MT ...', to "'the original text" as fully attested in extant manuscript witnesses'.¹⁵⁴ What stage in the development of a given biblical book should be called 'the original text'? This writer doubts that a single exemplar or archetype or prototype or Ur-text of any biblical book is recoverable. The evidence suggests that the biblical texts and stories were fluid and pluriform, changing and growing continually, dynamically and organically, and this diachronic complexity makes the question of 'the original text' unanswerable. Second, what then is the aim of textual criticism? This issue is discussed in all handbooks on textual criticism. For example, Tov believes the text-

¹⁵² Ulrich 1998a: 83.

¹⁵³ E.g., Ulrich 2000: 128.

¹⁵⁴ Ulrich 1999: 12-16.

critic seeks the 'completed literary composition which had already passed through several written stages and which stood at the beginning of the process of textual transmission'.¹⁵⁵ However, if Ulrich is correct, the 'end of the process of the composition of a biblical book' was nothing more than the 'abrupt interruption of the composition process for external, hostile reasons (the Roman threat or the Rabbinic-Christian debates)'. In view of these dilemmas, the principal text-critical aim in this thesis is the detection of earlier and later forms of biblical texts or stories, or to state it differently, the discovery of earlier and later stages in their editorial histories.¹⁵⁶

Finally, the explanation promised in 1.3.3 for the relative homogeneity of the textual traditions of Chronicles in comparison with Samuel (and Kings) follows. The book of Chronicles has held an inferior position in the annals of Jewish and Christian scholarly activity from the earliest times to the present day.¹⁵⁷ This marginalised doublet was/is considered a contradictory repetition and/or supplement marked by less importance, reliability and authority, and worthy of less attention and use, than its counterparts in the Former Prophets. The evidence indicates that the book was studied, revised, transmitted, and copied differently and less frequently than the books of Samuel and Kings. Consequently, the textual fluidity and pluriformity evident in the early versions of Samuel and Kings are uncharacteristic of the early versions of Chronicles. In short, the disarray in Samuel's textual traditions is the consequence of systematic revision, whereas the state of Chronicles' textual traditions is the result of regular disinterest and neglect.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁵ Tov 2001: 17-18, 177-180, 287-291.

¹⁵⁶ Compare Rofé 1997: 402.

¹⁵⁷ Ben Zvi 1988; Japhet 1999; Kalimi 1998; cf. Treballe Barrera 2000c.

¹⁵⁸ Ackroyd 1973: 42; Curtis and Madsen 1910: 36; Würthwein 1979: 18.

2.3.2.2 Concept of a Rolling Corpus

The fluid and pluriform appearance of biblical texts and stories in the period of the Second Temple suggests that they developed gradually over a substantial period of time under the guidance of successive individuals or groups. Three helpful models for understanding this process are McKane's rolling corpus, Tov's and Ulrich's literary layers, and Fishbane's inner-biblical exegesis. The idea of a rolling corpus, or revision by supplementation, is not new to biblical studies and it is not unique to McKane. However, McKane develops and illustrates the concept at length in his analysis of Jeremiah. His point of departure is the radically different versions of Jeremiah preserved in the longer MT and 4QJer^a over against the shorter LXX and 4QJer^b.

Is Sept. a witness to a different and shorter text than MT, or is there only one Hebrew text to be recovered (MT) from which Sept. is derived by processes of abridgement and modification? I have concluded that Sept. gives us access to a Hebrew text which is shorter than MT, and so enables us to identify expansions of the Hebrew text in the period which lies between the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Sept. and MT. This is a conclusion which is not free from assumptions, but, even so, there is no firmer method than this and none which is so disciplined by objective control, and it is the right point of departure for the examination of the concept of a rolling *corpus*. There is a proximity to the facts which no other method possesses: the examination of extant texts and the observing of differences between them. The intention is not to assert that a higher criticism should never override these indications, or be pursued when it contradicts them, but its procedures are necessarily more speculative and are not controlled by such hard evidence. One should require a particularly sharp argument before assenting to a speculative kind of criticism which contradicts the indications of a more solid, textual evidence.¹⁵⁹

From here McKane adopts the concepts of 'kernel idea' and 'reservoir idea' from Holladay, Hyatt, and Thiel, and argues that a substantial portion (much of it prose) of MT Jeremiah was triggered or generated from the pre-existing text or part of it (much of it poetry). The book was handled, transmitted, and repeatedly recast through a process of interpretation and supplementation. 'In general, the theory is bound up with the persuasion

¹⁵⁹ McKane 1986: I, l-li; cf. l-lxxxiii; cf. 1999.

that the rolling corpus "rolled" over a long period of time and was still rolling in the post-exilic period'.¹⁶⁰

McKane's rolling corpus is a helpful model which has been insufficiently explored in relation to the Former Prophets. This is largely due to the history of research on Joshua–Kings. However, with reference to Samuel the current research trend is to move from sources to composition, and therefore it may be suggested that the rolling corpus is a good model for the developmental process. Auld explores 'the revision by supplementation of a common inherited text' in Samuel–Kings and Chronicles¹⁶¹, and elsewhere he argues that the earlier royal stories in these books were the classics on which later biblical authors of Genesis–Judges drew for their language, expressions, themes, situations, histories and stories.¹⁶² In more focused contributions, Auld and Ho argue that the longer story in MT 1 Samuel 17–18 was revised by means of supplementation from a shorter one similar to LXX^B 1 Samuel 17–18. Their conclusion is that

All the major MT pluses can be explained when they are read side by side with the characterization of Saul in 1 Samuel 9–10. ... Our hypothesis is that all these points about David (i.e. most of the MT pluses) are supplements, modelled by a redactor upon the story of Saul with the purpose of contrasting David and Saul.¹⁶³

This thesis argues that the process and intent of the revision in MT 1 Samuel 17–18 are observable in MT 2 Samuel 6.

2.3.2.3 Concept of Literary Layers

Ulrich's third step for studying variant literary editions is: 'the individual textual variants should be studied as a group, to see whether a significant number of them might

¹⁶⁰ McKane 1986: I, lxxxiii.

¹⁶¹ Auld 1994.

¹⁶² Auld 1998.

¹⁶³ Auld and Ho 1992: 38; cf. Auld 2004b.

display an intentional, systematic pattern'. Tov makes similar comments on interpolations.¹⁶⁴ With respect to Samuel, Tov says:

More importantly, if limited recensional differences are recognized within a certain book, such as in 1 Samuel 16–18, the complete book, in this case Samuel, is likely to reflect such features elsewhere, including in small details ...¹⁶⁵

Tov makes a similar claim for 1 Samuel 1–2:

If different editions of the Song of Hannah are assumed, evidence for them should also be visible in other chapters in the book of Samuel.¹⁶⁶

This writer, like Tov, recognises the difficulty in deciding whether or not a difference in a small detail is part of 'a more extensive stratum of changes' or 'an overall recensional layer'. Nevertheless, this thesis argues that many of the textual manipulations in the received text which are suggested by the totality of the versional evidence are intentional *and connected*, and represent a literary layer in the compositional process. More specifically, many adjustments in MT 2 Samuel 6 are connected to the language of stories in 1 Samuel sharing the theme 'Davidic displacement of the Saulide dynasty'. Having said this, however, it is not clear whether these adjustments were carried out at one time by a single individual, or group, or whether they represent the cumulative efforts of numerous individuals or groups over a substantial period of time. The latter seems more probable. This is reasonable since, as stated above, '(house of) David versus (house of) Saul' and/or 'Judah versus Benjamin' were important motifs in the exilic, post-exilic and post-biblical chapters of Israelite literature and history, long after a hypothetical tenth century BCE setting for the historical figures.

¹⁶⁴ Tov 1999: 68–69; cf. the discussions of literary layers in Tov 1997a: 238, 242, 261–263; 2001: 347–350.

¹⁶⁵ Tov 1997a: 242.

¹⁶⁶ Tov 1999: 434.

2.3.2.4 Concept of Inner-Biblical Exegesis

Scholars have long recognised that there are a variety of relationships between passages and books in the Bible, and they have sought to explain the origin and nature of the developments which led to these resemblances. The label 'midrash' in particular has been applied by many not only to the relationship of Chronicles to Samuel–Kings or of Deuteronomy to Exodus but also to other textual associations and interactions in the Bible. The label itself may be appropriate insofar as similar patterns of activity are observable in biblical and post-biblical literature; and indeed many think the origin of midrash proper is already visible in the Hebrew Bible.¹⁶⁷ Lim takes up these issues, discussing the origins and emergence of midrash in relation to Hebrew Bible.¹⁶⁸ 'Midrash' or 'midrashic', however, is only one pair of terms among many which scholars use for the variety of relationships between biblical passages and books and for editorial or scribal activities within these. For example, on one hand, biblical or textual, or inner-, inter- or intra-biblical or textual, and on the other hand, terms such as exegesis, commentary, interpretation, editing, revision, redaction or dialogue, are frequently joined to form such phrases as 'biblical exegesis' or 'inner-biblical interpretation' or 'inter-textual dialogue' and so on. There are a variety of perspectives on these phenomena, and scholars do not agree on a single label for all of them. This is due to the complexity of the relationships between the passages and books and to the diversity of scribal and editorial activities within them.

In recent years a number of scholars have written extensively on 'midrash' within Bible. From the United States, the obvious examples are Childs and Sanders, and a group of closely associated scholars, Sarna (who coined 'inner-biblical exegesis'), Fishbane, Brettler, Levinson and Sommers. Several Israelis have written extensively on this topic,

¹⁶⁷ For general discussion see Neusner 1987; Porton 1992.

¹⁶⁸ Lim 2004.

such as Seeligmann, Rofé and Zakovitch. A lesser known example, but no less prolific, who routinely talks in terms of '*Vorlage versus Targum*' and '*Historia o Midrás*', and with reference to Samuel–Kings too, is Treballe Barrera. Fishbane gave us the classic treatment.¹⁶⁹ In his compendium of exegetical insights he analyses hundreds of cases in which earlier biblical texts or traditions are taken up in later texts for authoritative reference, clarification, reinterpretation, and the like. Individual cases can be disputed, and the direction of movement is not always obvious, but Fishbane certainly demonstrates the growing and self-referential character of biblical literature.

The concepts of pluriformity, a rolling corpus, literary layers, and inner-biblical exegesis, combine to result in a serious difficulty: How can one distinguish between authors, editors and scribes? Who did what and how can we know? Who is the author, composer or writer? Who is the editor, redactor or reviser? Is an editor who gathers material a compiler, one who expands an augments or supplementer, and one who explains a glossator or interpreter? At what point does the role of author and editor cease and the role of scribe, copier, copyist or transmitter begin? The current evidence from the period of the Second Temple renders the distinction between these 'occupations' and 'practices' virtually impossible.¹⁷⁰

Ancient authors, editors and scribes used a variety of editorial or exegetical procedures. Peckham summarises these techniques, or marks or signs, under the headings 'repetition' and 'reversion'.¹⁷¹ Repetition may be resumptive or proleptic. Lexical repetition involves a catchword (a key word or phrase, 'Buber's leading word'), allusion or citation, a formula, or an adjacent term or phrase (Wiederaufnahme, synonymous/parallel word pair). Grammatical repetition involves a deictic marker, typically *אם, אשר, כי*

¹⁶⁹ Fishbane 1985.

¹⁷⁰ Fishbane 1985: 85 (and frequently), 543; Talmon 1975: 380-381; Tov 1999: 434.

¹⁷¹ Peckham 1995; cf. Fishbane 1985: 23-65; throughout Levinson 1997.

('namely'), זה ('this [means]'), הוא or היא ('it is'), or בעת ההיא. Structural repetition involves an inclusio or chiasm, such as 'Seidel's law' (abcdXd'e'b'a', where X is the contextually disruptive element). Reversion 'consists in a literarily unmotivated or grammatically irregular change of person, number, or gender combined with some repetition that, besides modifying the adjacent text, signals a connection between it and a prior or later non-contiguous context'. Unmarked editing is uncommon since as a rule 'writers and editors' wish to deliberately and clearly mark off their additions from the original. At the very least, their activity is marked by simple repetition or redundancy, which seems to be more than the product of accident or formal style.¹⁷²

Lexical repetition is an editorial technique encountered in a number of cases in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. Alter discusses this phenomenon in a chapter on techniques of repetition and then again in the conclusion to the book.¹⁷³ Simply stated, 'A Leitwort is a word or a word-root that recurs significantly in a text, in a continuum of texts, or in a configuration of texts ...'.¹⁷⁴ An article by Amit is entirely dedicated to the phenomenon of 'Buber's leading word':

In sum, the leading word is a linguistic expression repeated in identical or similar fashion in a text or a number of texts in a way that calls attention to the needs of strengthening messages in a text or to the relations among texts. Recognition of the fact that the biblical text has been transmitted over generations, and that, in any case, change and additions, deletions and adaptations, were made in it, raises the possibility that whoever was responsible for the appearance of the leading word is not necessarily the original author of the text. An assumption of this kind leaves room for the intervention of an editor or a highly resourceful adapter, who took the trouble of weaving into the text adaptations that suited his purposes.¹⁷⁵

It is shown in the analysis of 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 that particular words in *MT* 2 Samuel 6 seek to link acts of David in this passage to those of other characters in other passages ('word linkage').

¹⁷² This remains true in spite of occasional criticisms, e.g., B. O. Long 1987; Quick 1993.

¹⁷³ Alter 1981: 88-113, 179-180.

¹⁷⁴ Alter 1981: 93.

¹⁷⁵ Amit 1989: 109-110.

The last issue in this discussion of inner-biblical exegesis is that of methodical versus arbitrary adjustments in biblical texts. Ulrich and Tov suggest that individual variants which initially appear random may actually display a systematic pattern which can be recognised as a literary layer (2.3.2.1, 2.3.2.3). It is clear that ancient 'participants' in the composition and transmission of biblical texts *were partisan* in their tactics and objectives. This writer affirms that 'the study of any text must include a clear sense of its revisionary target'.¹⁷⁶ Conversely, major and minor alterations in biblical texts accumulated over substantial periods of time, and it is entirely uncertain how many individuals or groups of individuals intervened in any particular passage or book. This may have caused numerous disconnected adjustments. Person makes a case for the complex interplay between oral and written processes in the transmission of biblical literature. Rather than slavishly copying their texts word for word, scribes preserved the traditions with an oral mind set, thus generating variety and fluidity in their productions. In contrast to mere copyists, they were performers, allowing for variations as they did their work. What we perceive to be textual variants are rather the products of scribes who were faithful in their work of copying for communities of an oral culture.¹⁷⁷ The present thesis shows that many specific readings in MT 2 Samuel 6 are united in their affirmation of several related revisionary targets, namely, apology of Davidic kingship and apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character. Another significant theme in this material is cultic practice. Nevertheless, it is impossible to know precisely who or what groups are responsible for these adjustments and at what points in time they were made.

¹⁷⁶ Levinson 1997: 156.

¹⁷⁷ Person 1998, 1999, 2002: 83-101.

2.3.2.5 Principles of Textual Criticism

The writer accepts the standard text-critical procedures. Preference is given to mechanical or unintentional error rather than intentional alteration (when the former is justifiably probable)¹⁷⁸ and to internal rather than external criteria.¹⁷⁹ No *a priori* preference is given to any version of the story of David's ark transfer. All versions must be considered equally. None has a monopoly on 'earlier' readings. *The evidence does not permit the assumption that Hebrew witnesses should be valued more highly than Greek witnesses to a Hebrew original.* The uncritical acceptance of the MT in any particular instance may be tantamount to the emendation of an 'earlier' reading found elsewhere to a 'later' one found in the MT. With reference to the Septuagint, each manuscript, book and tradition must be individually examined in order to ascertain translation techniques and scribal tendencies. The personalities of the witnesses and the patterns of relationships must be kept in mind.¹⁸⁰ These standards are followed insofar as it is possible and necessary within the parameters of this thesis. Driver, following de Lagarde, makes these points in his discussion of 'the original text of the LXX':

If a verse or part of a verse appears in both a free and a slavishly literal translation, the former is to be counted the genuine rendering.

If two readings co-exist, of which one expresses the Massoretic text, while the other can only be explained from a text deviating from it, the latter is to be regarded as the original.

[These] canons formulate the principle for estimating double renderings in the same MS., or alternative renderings in different MSS., and derive their justification from the fact that the general method followed by later revisers and correctors was that of assimilating the renderings of the LXX to the Hebrew text (the 'Hebraica veritas') current in their day.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁸ On unintentional errors and intentional alterations see Tov 2001: 236-285.

¹⁷⁹ On internal and external text-critical criteria see Tov 2001: 298-310. These criteria are limited in value in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible.

¹⁸⁰ Greenspoon 1997: 156.

¹⁸¹ Driver 1890: xlv-xlv.

These judgments are followed judiciously rather than slavishly. The following comments are in order: First, Tov categorises 'doublet (conflate reading)' under 'unintentional variants' and refers to it as a 'mistaken juxtaposition'.¹⁸² Elsewhere, Tov distinguishes between 'doublets' and 'synonymous readings', listing the former under 'readings created in the course of the textual transmission' and the latter under 'readings intentionally created by scribes'. He qualifies 'doublets' by saying: 'These doublets sometimes resulted from an erroneous juxtaposition of elements, but in other cases they grew out of a conscious desire to preserve alternative readings'.¹⁸³ Tov may be correct that some doublets were created through the accidental insertion of interlinear or marginal elements, but this is the exception rather than the rule. Talmon and Treballe Barrera have repeatedly demonstrated that doublets in the Hebrew and Greek versions are typically conscious and deliberate.¹⁸⁴ Furthermore, scholars frequently malign the Greek versions, especially LXX^L, for its double readings; but this perspective neglects to appreciate the motivation and significance of these double readings. For the ancient it was more correct to retain (with reasonable modification for the sake of sense) the extant traditions, rather than allow one of them to fall into obscurity. 'Doublets thus illustrate the scribes' reverence for transmitted alternative readings which were invested with a measure of sacred authority'.¹⁸⁵ 'They prove that copyists had great respect for every existing variant reading transmitted in the mss'.¹⁸⁶ Second, as Driver points out, in cases of double or alternative readings, the reading dissimilar to the one found in the MT is probably the earlier reading. The disharmonious reading is best. This is particularly true when the MT reading is the one which harmonises or coheres best with the diction, style, or *Tendenz* (broadly

¹⁸² Tov 1992: 409.

¹⁸³ Tov 2001: 241-243, 260-261.

¹⁸⁴ Treballe Barrera 1989a, 1992a; Talmon 1960, 1961, 1976. The topic of Talmon's 1956 PhD thesis at the Hebrew University was conflate readings.

¹⁸⁵ Talmon 1976: 170.

¹⁸⁶ Treballe Barrera 1992a: 125.

understood) of the particular MT passage or book in which it is located. This may seem counter-intuitive, and in practice commentators routinely argue for the originality of an MT reading on these very grounds (i.e., it harmonises best with the diction, style, or *Tendenz* of the author). However, the suggested approach coincides with the general tendency of editors and scribes (and authors too) to harmonise readings and stories. A reading which is less harmonised and more disparate from the reading of the MT is generally the earlier reading in the history of textual growth.

It is stated in 2.3.2.1 that 'the original text' is unattainable, and consequently, the textual-exegetical task is to roll the process of textual formation back as far as the extant evidence permits. It is characteristic of recent generations of biblical scholars to use the versional data to discover the 'best reading' or correct a perceived 'error' in the received text's wording. This writer's conviction is that these academics have been so concerned with delineating the putative original that they have undervalued, and in many cases, neglected entirely, the significance of textual variation as evidence for the compositional process of biblical books. Textual variants, and grammatical and stylistic incongruities, frequently underscore important points in the literary development of a composition.¹⁸⁷ Consequently, textual criticism must not be separated from other forms of criticism (source, redaction, narrative, etc.). Furthermore, for each variant reading, in each version, one must ask what *function* that particular reading has in its own context. Childs' discussion of the text-critical task in a canonical context is germane.¹⁸⁸

Scholars too often correct a perceived 'error' in the MT, the received text, thus failing to ascribe integrity to that tradition and its unique developmental process and

¹⁸⁷ 'Las variantes textuales más significativas se verifican en los puntos débiles por tratarse muchas veces de hilos o de casos sueltos, a los que se ha cosido una pieza de un paño diferente, con un mal remiendo a veces. En el proceso posterior de transmisión del texto el tejido de la composición tiende a romperse y a corromperse precisamente por aquellos puntos de sutura' (Trebolle Barrera; source unidentified).

¹⁸⁸ Childs 1979: 84-106; esp. 103-105.

meaning. Related to this point, it is unnecessary to emend the MT once one realises that biblical authors, scribes and editors elevate polemic above literary coherence and historical veracity.¹⁸⁹ Thus, for example, many MT passages which scholars routinely emend *are in fact intelligible*. The interpretative task is to comprehend the meaning of these passages in their own right.

This is but one of several problems in [2 Sam. 21.1-14] which have long caused translators and commentators difficulty. It is common to solve them by amending the Masoretic Text with the help of the Septuagint. In some of these cases, the LXX's smooth and intelligible readings are seductively attractive, and it is correct that they should be considered. But it is the assumption of this paper that MT's angularities are probably not mistakes, but evidences of the text's use. They do not signal the text's corruptness, but its usefulness to the earliest communities which esteemed and transmitted it. MT is a used text, coming with marks of its own past service written into it.¹⁹⁰

2.3.2.6 Issue of Dating

This writer holds firm to no particular view about the dating of the (possible) sources or composition of the books of Samuel and Chronicles. Furthermore, in his view, scholars have not successfully dated these books or their contents to any particular period in Israel's pre-exilic or exilic or post-exilic history. At many points throughout this thesis, and in appendix 3, it is demonstrated that frequent assertions regarding earlier and later forms or uses or diachronic developments in biblical Hebrew are patently untenable.¹⁹¹

2.3.2.7 Tools for Grammatical and Lexical Analysis

The grammatical and lexical investigations in this thesis are dependent upon the standard Hebrew grammars¹⁹², lexica¹⁹³ and concordances¹⁹⁴ as well as computer

¹⁸⁹ The comment in W. R. Arnold 1917: 14 n. 2 on MT 2 Sam. 6.21 is pertinent.

¹⁹⁰ Walters 1993: 290; cf. 295; cf. 1988, 1991. Dever 1990: 11 describes the Bible as a curated artefact.

¹⁹¹ See Rezetko 2003.

¹⁹² GKC; JM; WO; Bergsträsser 1918; A. B. Davidson 1901; Ewald 1855, 1881; Kropat 1909; van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze 1999; Meyer 1992; Williams 1976.

software based on the machine-readable database 'Groves-Wheeler Westminster Hebrew Morphology'¹⁹⁵ which is incorporated into many Bible software products.¹⁹⁶

2.4 Summary of Chapter Two

In 2.1 (synchronic approach) the writer shows that a pro-David/anti-Saul polemic lies behind all of Samuel, figures in Judges, which serves as a preface to Samuel, moves beyond these compositions into the Writings, and continues in post-biblical literature. In 2.2 (diachronic approach) the writer presents the traditional criteria for discerning sources and editorial layers, and he suggests that the impasse between the synchronic and diachronic approaches to biblical literature may be resolved by means of the textual-exegetical approach, i.e., by the use of text-critical controls on redactional arguments. The versional evidence substantiates the validity of the diachronic approach—*there are* earlier and later forms of biblical texts and editions of biblical stories—and scholars can use this evidence to discern literary origins and developments—developments in the versions whose special features, and the reasons for them, may be perceived and appreciated through holistic or final-form readings. In 2.3 (textual-exegetical approach) the writer surveys the rebirth in the mid-twentieth century of the textual-exegetical approach. This resurgence was brought about by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *confirmation* of the textual pluriformity of the Bible in the Second Temple period. Three helpful models for understanding the developmental process of the biblical text are reviewed: McKane's rolling corpus, Tov's and Ulrich's literary layers, and Fishbane's inner-biblical exegesis. It is stated that the principal text-critical aim in this thesis is the

¹⁹³ *BDB*; *DBHE*; *DCH*; *HALOT*; *NIDOTTE* = VanGemeren 1997; *TDOT*; *TLOT* = Jenni and Westermann 1997; *TWOT* = Harris, Archer and Waltke 1980.

¹⁹⁴ Even-Shoshan 1990; Mandelkern 1977.

¹⁹⁵ See <http://www.wts.edu/hebrew>.

¹⁹⁶ This writer uses, in order of preference, GRAMCORD for Windows 2.4, Bible Windows 7.0 and BibleWorks for Windows 5.0.

detection of earlier and later forms of biblical texts or stories, or to state it differently, the discovery of earlier and later stages in their editorial histories. More specifically, a major goal of this thesis is to demonstrate that many details in the story of the ark in MT 2 Samuel 6 are related to a pro-David/anti-Saul polemic. It has gone unnoticed that many details outside the Michal material in MT 2 Samuel 6 are secondary and aimed at advancing the contrast between King David and Saul. Many adjustments in MT 2 Samuel 6 are connected to the language of stories in 1 Samuel sharing the theme 'Davidic displacement of the Saulide dynasty'.

CHAPTER THREE

Analysis of 2 Samuel 6.1-5 and 1 Chronicles 13.5-8

3.0 Introduction

The material in 2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8, as well as the supplement in 1 Chron. 13.1-4¹⁹⁷, reports David's initial attempt to bring the ark to Jerusalem. The synoptic verses relate that David assembles a group of Israelites, and they go to bring the ark to Jerusalem, which is mounted on a cart guided by attendants, while they all celebrate with dance and music on the way back. This initial portion of the plot, which may be called the exposition, presents information essential to the story. It is clear that David is the main character (*who?*; the protagonist) and his mission is to get the ark (*what?*; the situation). The reason for David's mission (*why?*), however, is not related in 2 Samuel 6, although a limited explanation is given in 1 Chron. 13.3: '... for we did not turn to it in the days of Saul'. Nevertheless, neither narrative explains the intrinsic significance of the ark which ultimately provokes David's undertaking. The exposition's depiction of the setting is also unclear with respect to both time (*when?*) and place (*where?*), and Samuel and Chronicles differ on several points. Regarding the occasion, and in addition to the enigmatic עור in 2 Sam. 6.1, David's enterprise is placed *after* his defeat of the Philistines in Samuel (2 Sam. 5.17-25) but *before* it in Chronicles (1 Chron. 14.8-17). See 1.2. The geographic information in the versions of 2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8 is particularly difficult to construe. Does the march set out from Jerusalem or from some other location in Israel? To where does the procession arrive, or in other words, where is the ark located prior to its relocation to Jerusalem? The exposition also refers to other

¹⁹⁷ See 1.2.3. For comments on the individualistic focus in Samuel versus the presentation in Chronicles see Japhet 1993: 273-277; Williamson 1982: 113-115.

background information such as additional participants and their conduct, the manner in which the ark is transported (*how?*), and the ark's epithet, but these issues are not free of problems. First, what are the identity and number of the Israelites who accompany David? The relative agreement among the versions of 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 on the conduct of the participants stands out against the difficulties evident in the second half of the story. Second, the ark is conveyed on an animal-drawn cart guided by attendants, but who are these persons and what is their physical position with respect to the ark during the procession? Third, what should be made of the different epithets given to the ark, especially in 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6? Significant problems and discrepancies are evident in the versions of 2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8. A thorough commentary on 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 would enlarge this thesis at least four-fold; consequently, the analysis provided here concentrates on textual variation and on grammatical and stylistic incongruities and lexical discrepancies, which point to editorial adjustments in the compositions.

3.1 Analysis

3.1.1 The Story's Context and Occasion

3.1.1.1 The Literary Context

The storyline in 1 Chronicles 11–16 vis-à-vis 2 Samuel 5–6, 23 clearly portrays David's first act after his coronation as a religious one. This is indicated by the location of the material on David's consolidation of his kingdom in 2 Sam. 5.11-25 // 1 Chron. 14.1-16 as well as by the topics of Chronicles' non-synoptic material in 1 Chron. 13.1-4; 15.1-24; 16.4-42. See 1.2.3. It is a separate matter, however, whether Chronicles' variations in vocabulary in the parallel portions of the ark story are adjustments which coincide with

the story's religious framework. These will be addressed in the analysis of the details of the story.

The review of research in 1.2 refers to the kinds of readings given for David's ark story. The alleged inconsistency between the story as a religious episode and the military language of 2 Sam. 6.1, namely *בַּחֹר בִּישְׂרָאֵל* and *שְׁלִשִּׁים אֶלֶף*, as well as the presence of *עוֹד* and the partial doubling with verse two (*וַיָּקָם וַיֵּלֶךְ דָּוִד וְכָל־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ*), have suggested to many that the verse is either displaced or interpolated. However, the facts do not facilitate a decision regarding the authenticity of the verse as a whole. The analysis of the details, nevertheless, will contend that particular features within this verse of Samuel were adjusted to underscore a pro-David/anti-Saul polemic. See 1.2.

3.1.1.2 2 Sam. 6.1
1 Chron. 13.5

וַיָּקָם עוֹד דָּוִד
וַיִּקְהַל דָּוִד

וַיָּקָם is vocalised as an H *wayyiqtol* 3ms form of *קָם*, but the absence of a complementary verb (either an infinitive or a *wayyiqtol* form) explaining what David 'did again' suggests that *וַיָּקָם* must be related to the verb *אָקַם*.¹⁹⁸ This is also supported by *συνήγαγεν* in Greek Samuel and by an equivalent verb in the versions of Chronicles. The form *וַיָּקָם* may have originated as a defective spelling of *וַיֵּאָקַם* due to *aleph* quiescence (cf. Ps. 104.29 and Mic. 4.6), although the G *wayyiqtol* 3ms form of *אָקַם* elsewhere appears as *וַיֵּאָקַם* (as in 2 Sam. 10.17; 12.29; cf. 1 Sam. 14.52; 2 Sam. 11.27, with a suffixed pronoun).

¹⁹⁸ *וַיָּקָם עוֹד* in Samuel is always followed by a complementary infinitive (1 Sam. 3.6 [the infinitive intervenes]; 7.13; 23.4; 27.4; 2 Sam. 2.22, 28; 5.22; 7.20; 14.10), except for one instance where a complementary *wayyiqtol* follows (2 Sam. 18.22). The construction *וַיָּקָם עוֹד* (from *קָם*) followed only by a direct object cannot be construed with any sense.

The verb קהל in 1 Chron. 13.5 was not substituted for אסף on the basis of linguistic chronology¹⁹⁹, but it may have arisen under the influence of the noun קהל in non-synoptic 13.2, 4, and it is perhaps also related to Chronicles' portrayal of Israel as a liturgical קהל.²⁰⁰ However, noteworthy points are: (1) The verbs אסף and קבץ are used similarly to קהל in Chronicles, as in 1 Chron. 11.1; 19.17, where 'all Israel' is the object (cf. 23.2). (2) קהל is not substituted elsewhere in Chronicles for אסף in the *Vorlage* although this could have been expected in some passages (e.g., 1 Chron. 19.17). (3) Chronicles uses the verbs קהל and אסף side-by-side in 1 Chron. 15.3-4 in a religious context, but the referents are Israel, and priests and Levites, respectively. (4) The verb קהל does not occur in non-synoptic 2 Chronicles 29–30 which deals with Hezekiah's cleansing of the temple and the celebration of the Passover, although the verb אסף occurs on five occasions, and the noun קהל on thirteen, and these occur together in context in 2 Chron. 30.2-4, 13.

Most believe the adverb עוד was inserted by catch-word influence in the text once אסף had 'become' יסף, but עוד is unnecessary following יסף (e.g., 1 Sam. 3.6, 8) and only about one-quarter of the occurrences of יסף and only about one-third in Samuel are with עוד. Rather, עוד was probably inserted deliberately, but why? The full answer to this question will be given after the discussion of the participants' identity and number (3.1.3.1). Prior to 2 Sam. 6.1 it is never explicitly stated that David assembled a group of Israelites for battle, but 1 Sam. 18.5, 13 and 2 Sam. 5.2 do report that David under Saul was a military commander with an army at his disposal. Prior to his exile (1 Sam. 19.12) one supposes that he assembled his troops on a regular basis for the encounters with the Philistines (1 Sam. 18.27, 30; 19.8), and one also supposes that he did the same for the battles against the Jebusites in 2 Sam. 5.6-9 and twice against the Philistines in 2 Sam.

¹⁹⁹ See appendix 3.

²⁰⁰ Riley 1993: 166-167.

5.17-21, 22-25. Does ויסף עוד imply one or more of these occasions or does the text mean to say that David assembles a group of Israelites which had been *explicitly* assembled until that time by *another*?

In view of 1 Chron. 11.1, 4 the retention of עוד following ויקהל would have made good sense in 1 Chron. 13.5 if it had been in the *Vorlage*. For this reason, and because עוד usually does occur in Chronicles in other synoptic passages²⁰¹, the plus in Samuel is probably an insertion. Was אסף altered to קהל in Chronicles? This is possible for the reasons cited above. Could קהל have been altered to אסף in Samuel? In Samuel the noun קהל occurs in 1 Sam. 17.47 and the verb קהל is the *Qere* reading in 2 Sam. 20.14. The ensuing discussion of the participants' identity and number will show that it is equally possible that Samuel contains the adjusted verb lexeme. However, in the end, it is uncertain whether אסף or קהל is the earlier reading.

3.1.1.3	2 Sam. 6.2	ויקם וילך דוד ... להעלות משם
	1 Chron. 13.6	ויעל דויד ... להעלות משם
	1 Chron. 13.5	להביא

Dhorme and Hertzberg notice the anomalous accentuation in MT Samuel's ויקם and suggest the insertion of additional words²⁰², whereas W. R. Arnold and McCarter consider ויקם inauthentic.²⁰³ In narrative the verb קום often 'functions idiomatically as "begin to do something"²⁰⁴ or 'refers to preparatory activity, especially (although not exclusively) pursuant to traveling'.²⁰⁵ It has gone unnoticed, however, that קום followed by

²⁰¹ עוד occurs in both versions in thirteen synoptic passages. It does not occur in Chronicles in five synoptic passages (2 Sam. 6.1 // 1 Chron. 13.5; 2 Sam. 7.19 // 1 Chron. 17.17; 2 Sam. 21.18 // 1 Chron. 20.4; 1 Kgs. 10.10 // 2 Chron. 9.9; 1 Kgs. 12.2 // 2 Chron. 10.2). It occurs in Chronicles alone in two synoptic passages (2 Sam. 5.23 // 1 Chron. 14.14; 2 Kgs. 22.9 // 2 Chron. 34.16).

²⁰² Dhorme 1910: 318; Hertzberg 1964: 275.

²⁰³ W. R. Arnold 1917: 41; McCarter 1984: 161 (cf. translation).

²⁰⁴ Martens 1997: 903.

²⁰⁵ Coppes 1980a: 793.

a verb of movement²⁰⁶ with the same subject occurs most frequently in Samuel (nearly 40 times—all but six in 1 Samuel 16–31 and 2 Samuel 11–19) and *never* in Chronicles. In addition, the construction occurs only twice in synoptic passages, in this verse and in 1 Sam. 31.12 // 1 Chron. 10.12. In the latter passage Samuel but not Chronicles has וילכו כל-הלילה, which is an expansion intended to criticise the 'heroic' acts of the men of Jabesh-gilead.²⁰⁷ The evidence suggests that in both cases Samuel's construction is a stylistic, and perhaps thematic, modification. Chronicles' ויעל is not clearly the result of orthographic confusion, 'linguistic tendency'²⁰⁸, or a different perception of the story's geography (see below).²⁰⁹ It is impossible to know for certain whether הלך or עלה is the earlier verb. If it were the latter, then upon the addition of the קום clause, the resultant קום קהל, which occurs only in 1 Sam. 13.15 in Samuel, would easily give way to קום והלך, which makes up about half of the nearly forty cases of the construction in Samuel.²¹⁰

²⁰⁶ The occurrence subsequent to קום of each of the following 33 verbs of movement was located and examined: ארח, אשר, אחזה, בוא, ברח, ברח, דרך, דרך, זור, הלך, חמק, וחל, ירד, יצא, נגש, נוס, נחת, נסע, סבב, סאן, סור, סור, עבר, עדה, עלה, עלה, עדה, עבר, סור, סבב, סאן, נסע, נחת, נוס, נגש, ירד, יצא, חמק, וחל, זור, הלך, דרך, ברח, בוא, אחזה, אשר, ארח, שור, שוב, שטה, רכב, רץ, רדף, קרב, צעד, פשע, פנה, ערך.

²⁰⁷ Ho 1994: 41-43; cf. McKenzie 1984: 60. Fields 1992: 17-32; 1997: 103-114 discusses the biblical motif of night-time.

²⁰⁸ The generalisation in Japhet 1987: 35 n. 92 demands a full-length study.

²⁰⁹ The reading καὶ ἀνέγαγεν αὐτὸν in LXX^{AB} 1 Chron. 13.6 could reflect ויעלה in the *Vorlage*, but more than likely reflects the translator's interpretation of ויעל as an H rather than a G form, in which case it became necessary to insert a direct object.

²¹⁰ Observe that Chronicles says 'David went up (ויעל) ... to bring up (להעלות)' which could be considered the *lectio difficilior* due to lexical redundancy. It is unclear whether the verb עלה is used in 2 Sam. 6.2 (once) and 1 Chron. 13.6 (twice) because of the stories' conception of the topography or because sacred places are usually situated in prominent locations, often elevated on a mound or mountain. Apart from stylistic variation, there is no apparent reason for Chronicles' use of להביא in 13.5 instead of להעלות as in v. 6.

3.1.2 The Story's Geography

3.1.2.1 The Procession's Origin

Where were David and the Israelites prior to going for the ark? In their present arrangements Samuel and Chronicles apparently situate them in different places, the former in the Shephelah (cf. 2 Sam. 5.25) and the latter in Jerusalem (cf. 1 Chron. 11.4-8). However, these are literary depictions. It is impossible to know what span of time elapsed between the events related in 2 Samuel 5 and 6 and whether David and the Israelites returned to Jerusalem during that period. Furthermore, many believe the historical sequence of events related in 2 Samuel 5 is first the removal of the Philistine threat and then the conquest of Jerusalem; that is, the battles in 5.17-25 originally stood between the coronation in 5.1-3 and the conquest in 5.6-9.²¹¹ Consequently, the position of the geographic description גֹּזֵר מִגִּבְעַת עֵד־בְּאֶךְ גֹּזֵר in 5.25 immediately prior to the geographic descriptions in 6.2-4 is significant from a literary perspective.

3.1.2.2	2 Sam. 6.2	מִבְּעַל־יְהוּדָה //
	1 Chron. 13.6	בְּעֵלְתָּהּ אֶל־קִרְיַת יְעָרִים אֲשֶׁר לִיְהוּדָה
	1 Chron. 13.5	מִקִּרְיַת יְעָרִים

Most commentators on Samuel and Chronicles think the original story had a geographic reference to Baal(ah) Judah²¹², reconstructed as יְהוּדָה preceded by בְּעַל or a variant (בְּעֵלִי or בְּעֵלְתָּהּ) which was subsequently glossed with Kiriath-jearim in one textual tradition (Chronicles and 4QSam^a—as in Josh. 15.9, 60; 18.14)²¹³ but distorted into a gentile phrase in another (Samuel).²¹⁴ Scholars agree that Baal(ah) Judah and

²¹¹ McCarter 1984: 157-160. See the discussion in 1.2.2 of 2 Samuel 6 and 2 Sam. 5.13-8.18.

²¹² Modern English translations have 'to' (NAB, NASB, NIB) or 'from' (ASV, ESV, JPS, KJV, NIV, NKJV, NRSV, RSV) 'Baale-judah' or 'Baala(h) of Judah'.

²¹³ The belated association of the ark with Kiriath-jearim is one point in favour of the literary priority of 2 Samuel 6 over 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2. Compare 2 Sam. 6.2 and 1 Sam. 6.21; 7.1-2.

²¹⁴ The related biblical references are Josh. 3.16; 9.17; 15.9-11, 60; 18.14-15, 28; Judg. 18.12; 1 Sam. 6.21; 7.1-2; 2 Sam. 6.2; Jer. 26.20; Ps. 132.6; Ezra 2.25; Neh. 7.29; 1 Chron. 2.50, 52-53; 13.5-6; 2 Chron.

Kiriath-jearim were located in the hill country northwest of Jerusalem, but other questions remain unsettled: Do Baal(ah) Judah and Kiriath-jearim refer to one place only or to two different places? What is/are the exact location(s) of Baal(ah) Judah and Kiriath-jearim? Was/were Baal(ah) Judah and Kiriath-jearim originally allotted to Benjamin or Judah? Why are references to this/these place(s) so divergent in the Hebrew and Greek Bibles, especially in Joshua? How did the ark become associated with Baal(ah) Judah and/or Kiriath-jearim instead of a more prominent Israelite sanctuary? This chapter cannot address such questions, and it will not dispute the consensus described above, except for one point: MT Samuel's gentilic phrase מבעלי יהודה is a revision rather than a corruption.²¹⁵

What does מבעלי יהודה mean and why did it become the undisputed reading in the Masoretic and Greek versions of Samuel? The phrase refers undoubtedly to a group of people rather than a place, and in addition to the Greek versions it is interpreted this way by Aquila and Symmachus (ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχόντων Ἰουδα), the Vulgate (*de viris Iuda*), the Peshitta (ܡܥܠܝ ܕܒܝܬ ܝܗܘܕܐ), and Targum Jonathan (מקרייא דבית יהודה). The phrase does

1.4. For in-depth discussion see dictionary and encyclopaedia entries, volumes on geography and historical geography, and commentaries on Joshua and Samuel. The following deserve special mention: Blenkinsopp 1969 *passim*; commentaries: Boling 1982 and Nelson 1997 on Joshua 9, 15, 18; W. R. Arnold 1917: 52-59; McCarter 1984: 162-163; Stoebe 1994: 188; text-critical discussions: Herbert 1997b: 122; McKenzie 1984: 47-48; Pisano 1984: 101-104; Ulrich 1978: 198-199. It is impossible to discuss here all the facets of this textual problem. The following points sum up the significant issues which are not summarised in the consensus expressed above: (1) The preposition מן in Samuel's מבעלי יהודה is unoriginal. Movement in the original version and in the present versions is toward rather than from (מן) a place, although the meaning of the text is construed feasibly by scholars who emend it to 'from (מן) Baal(ah) Judah'. (2) The phrase εἰς πόλιν Δαυιδ in Greek Chronicles is an intra-Septuagintal reading derived by initially reading עיר for קריית, or encouraged by the translator's conception of the direction of movement, or motivated by the desire to avoid the inappropriate resonance of Baal(ah). (3) The phrase τοῦ βουνοῦ in LXX^L Samuel is an addition intended to smooth the meaningless ἐν ἀναβάσει standing alone, and is derived contextually from 2 Sam. 6.3-4. (4) The phrases ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων Ἰουδα and ἐν ἀναβάσει in Greek Samuel are a double reading reflecting מבעלי יהודה and בעלי <יהודה> respectively. The original Greek reading is ἐν ἀναβάσει Ἰουδα to which the revised reading ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων is prefixed in order to reflect more closely the received version. See Herbert 1997b: 122; McKenzie 1984: 47-48; Ulrich 1978: 198-199.

²¹⁵ The following scholars believe the gentilic phrase *makes good sense* but they take it as the *original* reading: W. R. Arnold 1917: 58-59; Blenkinsopp 1969: 146, 152; 1972: 10, 80-81; Caird 1953: 1077; Campbell 1975: 171.

not mean 'lords' or 'rulers' of Judah as many surmise²¹⁶ but rather 'citizens' or 'inhabitants' or 'landowners' of Judah.²¹⁷ The commoner rather than the elite is in view. Early editors of Samuel may have altered the text in order to avoid the inappropriate resonance of Baal(ah)²¹⁸, or because only Judean soldiers would be returning with David to Jerusalem after battle²¹⁹, or because the transfer of the ark to Jerusalem was a noteworthy event for Judeans more than others.²²⁰ Most significantly, shortly it is demonstrated that later editors of Samuel consigned the ark בגבעה (2 Sam. 6.3-4) rather than to Baal(ah) Judah.

3.1.2.3	2 Sam. 6.3	וירכבו ... אל-עגלה חדשה ...
	2 Sam. 6.3, 4	וישאוהו מבית אבינר אשר בגבעה
	1 Chron. 13.7	וירכיבו ... על-עגלה חדשה מבית אבינר

The grammar of the הרכב אל ('mount upon') and נשא מן ('bring/carry/take away/from/off/out') clauses in 2 Sam. 6.3 is disrupted only by the unoriginal אל in the former²²¹ whereas the absence of the verb נשא in Chronicles makes הרכב govern a prepositional phrase introduced by על and another one introduced by מן. Chronicles' הרכב מן construction is artificial and suggests that either the verb נשא was deleted or the prepositional phrase מבית אבינר was added.²²² Allen, following Fishbane, suggests that

²¹⁶ This notion is expressed by זקני יהודה in Samuel (1 Sam. 30.26; 2 Sam. 19.12; cf. 2 Kgs. 23.1 // 2 Chron. 34.29; Ezek. 8.1). There is a large number of words in biblical Hebrew for leaders and rulers.

²¹⁷ BDB 127; HALOT I, 143. See Num. 21.28; Josh. 24.11; Judg. 9.2-47 (15 times); 20.5; 1 Sam. 23.11-12 (two times); 2 Sam. 21.12. W. R. Arnold and Caird (see above) read 'fighting men of Judah' but this misrepresents the vocabulary.

²¹⁸ See Ginsburg 1897: 399-404.

²¹⁹ W. R. Arnold 1917: 59.

²²⁰ Campbell 1975: 171.

²²¹ Observe LXX Samuel's ἐπί and 4QSam^a's על. See Herbert 1997b: 121, 123; McCarter 1984: 163. See 4.1.3.5 and appendix 3 on the interchange between אל and על.

²²² The only other occurrence of הרכב מן is 2 Kgs. 23.30 (// 2 Chron. 35.24) in which ממתוך is probably an interpolation. 'The Hebrew statement is certainly terse beyond comparison' (Montgomery and Gehman 1951: 537-538). The frequent translation 'carry, drive, transport' for הרכב in 2 Kgs. 23.30 and 1 Chron. 13.7 is awkward since the verb generally refers to position rather than movement. Space does not permit the development of this point.

נשא was omitted due to its religious connotation in 1 Chron. 15.2, 15, 26-27²²³, but 1 Chron. 13.6 explicitly seats the ark on a cart, and this does away with any supposed tension. Conversely, the only other case of נשא מן with spatial significance in Samuel is 1 Sam. 4.4 where the people of Shiloh bring out the ark in preparation for battle against the Philistines. In addition, נשא is significant elsewhere in Samuel for relating the movements of the ark (1 Sam. 4.4; 2 Sam. 6.13; 15.24). Finally, Murray demonstrates that וישארו in 6.3-4 'reinforces the sense of victory celebration through a link' with וישאם in 5.21 (cf. 1 Chron. 14.12).²²⁴ To conclude, it is suggested that the interesting detail that the ark is housed in the בית אבינדר, which is probably a reference to a temple or a complex containing a temple, is interpolated in Chronicles from Samuel, and the phrase may also be inauthentic in 1 Sam. 7.1 and 2 Sam. 6.3-4.

The supplementary comment in 2 Sam. 6.3-4 (also in 1 Sam. 7.1) that the בית אבינדר is בגבעה is customarily interpreted as a topographical feature and rendered as 'the house of Abinadab that/which is/was in/on the hill'. This understanding suffers the following limitations: (1) The rendering 'in/on the hill' for בגבעה is ambiguous in context and in Samuel. (2) הגבעה cannot be construed convincingly as a known district of Baal(ah) Judah or Kiriath-jearim on the basis of Josh. 18.28.²²⁵ (3) The position of a locale *on* a familiar hill is expressed more appropriately by על הגבעה. (4) The noun במה rather than גבעה would be the suitable term in Samuel for a well-known shrine if this meaning were intended (cf. 1 Sam. 9.12-14, 19, 25; 10.5, 13). (5) Alternatively, the noun רמה could have been used, as in 1 Sam. 22.6: '... Saul was sitting at Gibeah (בגבעה) under the tamarisk tree on the height (ברמה) ...'. Interestingly, הגבעה and הרמה are used similarly. The noun רמה is always used with the article (הרמה), except in Josh. 13.26 (רמת המצפה); Josh. 19.8 (ראמה).

²²³ Allen 1999: 385; Fishbane 1985: 392-394.

²²⁴ Murray 1998: 32-33, 96-98, 104, 122.

²²⁵ Boling 1982: 428, 431-432; Nelson 1997: 211-212.

גִּבְעָה); Judg. 15.17 (רָמָה לְחֵי); Ezek. 16.24, 25, 31, 39 ('lofty place'); Neh. 11.33 (Ramah); and always refers to Ramah, except in 1 Sam. 22.6. The bottom line is this: הַגְּבֵעָה ('the hill') is Gibeah in the absence of additional clarification.²²⁶ However, few contemplate and even fewer embrace this rendering in 2 Sam. 6.3-4 since it contradicts *their corrected* Baal(ah) Judah in 2 Sam. 6.2. 'Gibeah' is considered a possibility ('perhaps') by BDB²²⁷ and Propp.²²⁸ Jerome's Vulgate²²⁹, the King James Version, and Sime²³⁰ and Murray²³¹ support this view.²³² In addition, Fox renders the text 'in Giv'a'²³³ and Brettler says 'The main theme of 2 Samuel 6 ... is the conveyance of the ark from Gibeah to Jerusalem ...'.²³⁴ Finally, Blenkinsopp also argues this view²³⁵, but as discussed in 2.1 he takes 'Gibeah' as a covert reference to Gibeon. It must be stressed that nothing in the present text of MT 2 Sam. 6.2-4 disallows 'Gibeah' and the only evidence against it is the *emendation* of מִבְּעֵלִי in 2 Sam. 6.2 and the remote linkage of the ark with Kiriath-jearim in 1 Sam. 6.21-7.2²³⁶ and 1 Chron. 13.5-6. As a matter of fact the following points argue in favour of the reading 'Gibeah': (1) The juxtaposition of מִגְּבֵעַ עֵד־בְּאֵךְ גִּזְרִי in 5.25 and בְּגִבְעָה in 6.3-4 creates a historical-geographic link which makes a rhetorically forceful

²²⁶ For other examples of the noun + article combination elevated to such a position of uniqueness that they have become the equivalents of proper names see *JM* §137b, p. 505; *WO* §13.6a, p. 249.

²²⁷ BDB 149.

²²⁸ Propp 1992: 433.

²²⁹ The Vulgate has 'Gabaa', and Bressan 1960: 523 aptly remark 'al contrario delle altre volte, qui S. Gir. ha preso per nome proprio el nome comune «in colle»'.

²³⁰ Sime 1902: 113.

²³¹ Murray 1998: 53, 56, 102, 113, 118-119. However, he erroneously locates 'a Gibeah' at Baal(ah) Judah, which he also equates with Kiriath-jearim, thus conflating the extant literary traditions.

²³² Unfortunately, Greek Samuel is unhelpful here since the book routinely represents הַגְּבֵעָה (= 'Gibeah') by ὁ βουός (1 Sam. 10.10; 14.2; 22.6; 23.19; 26.1). Greek Samuel expresses 'Gibeah' of 'Benjamin' or 'Saul' with transliteration (1 Sam. 11.4; 13.2; 13.15; 14.16; 15.34; 2 Sam. 21.6; 23.29) but with ὁ βουός when 'Gibeah' is further defined by another proper noun (1 Sam. 10.5; 23.19; 26.1, 3; 2 Sam. 2.24).

²³³ Fox 1999: 174.

²³⁴ Brettler 1995: 27.

²³⁵ Blenkinsopp 1969: 150; 1972: 64, 79-83.

²³⁶ The statement that the ark was at Kiriath-jearim for 20 years (1 Sam. 7.2) is no less suspicious than the figures given for the judgeship of Samuel (1 Sam. 4.18; 40 years), the reign of Saul (1 Sam. 13.1; x years), and the reign of David (2 Sam. 5.4-5; 40 years).

point regarding David's success against the Philistines.²³⁷ (2) Scholars frequently assert the ark's absence in Samuel from 1 Sam. 7.2 to 2 Sam. 6.2 but this is false for MT Samuel which relates that Saul in Gibeah (1 Sam. 14.2, 5 ['Geba'], 16) requested the 'ark of God' (1 Sam. 14.18) in his battle against the Philistines. Saul's request for the ark in the vicinity of Gibeah and David's transfer of the ark from the **בית אבינאדב** in Gibeah to Jerusalem is hardly a chance association.²³⁸ (3) MT's statements in 1 Sam. 14.18, 2 Sam. 5.25, and 2 Sam. 6.2-4 constitute an anti-Saul polemic which announces David's control over Saul's Gibeah and Saul's ark.²³⁹ David finishes the military task which Saul is unable to adequately and fully complete and David recovers the religious symbol which Saul is

²³⁷ In addition to the remarks of Blenkinsopp and Murray, cited above, see Hertzberg 1964: 278; McCarter 1984: 157, 159-160. See the discussion of Geba and Gibeah in 2.1. The former antecedent of **מִשְׁכַּן** in 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6 is Baal(ah) Judah. In Samuel the present antecedent is the expression **בְּבֵרֵךְ עֵדֻד** in 5.25 and in Chronicles it is the glossed statement **בְּעֵלְהָהּ אֶל-קִרְיַת יְעִרִים** in 13.6.

²³⁸ Most scholars emend MT 1 Sam. 14.18's **אָרֹן** to **אֶפֶד** on the basis of the Greek and OL evidence, whereas another significant group of scholars retains the MT reading as the *lectio difficilior*, but for the most part these fail to explain the significance of the MT reading. It is impossible here to review the literature on 1 Sam. 14.18 and the theories that there were multiple arks in ancient Israel or that **אֶפֶד**, wherever in the Bible it (apparently) stands for a solid object, has been deliberately and systematically substituted for **אָרֹן**, with the single and accidental exception of 1 Sam. 14.18. The MT version of this verse is meaningless, 'And Saul said to Ahijah, "Bring the ark of God", for the ark of God was/existed in that day, and the sons of Israel', and this nonsense is a certain mark of editorial activity in the verse. There are a number of reasons for accepting **אֶפֶד** as the earlier reading, such as (1) the concurrence of priest and ephod in the stories of Saul and David in 1 Samuel; (2) the reason for the request, i.e., oracular consultation, which fits best with the appearances of the so-called divinatory ephod in 1 Samuel; and (3) the language of the passage, such as the statement 'withdraw your hand' in v. 19, the reference to urim and thummim in v. 41, and the singular number of the verbs **נָשָׂא** (v. 3) and **נָשָׂא** (v. 18), which is especially significant since elsewhere a plurality of persons is responsible for the transport of the ark. The presumed originality of **אֶפֶד**, however, *does not erase the requirement* to explain the significance of the later and canonical form of the biblical text having **אָרֹן**. It is unnecessary to emend the MT when one can accept that biblical authors, scribes and editors elevate polemic above literary coherence and historical veracity. Related discussion is given in 5.1.3.7.

²³⁹ Edelman 1992: 22-23 locates the **בְּבֵרֵךְ עֵדֻד** southwest of Gibeon, but on the whole her historical reconstruction supports the view argued here: 'The ark almost certainly played a central role within Saul's national cult, a fact that led David to move it to his new capital at Jerusalem. As the site of the ark prior to David's reign, it is plausible that "Abinadab's hill" is an oblique reference to the religious capital of Saul's state. Textual tradition (esp. 1 Kings 3-9 and 2 Chronicles 1-2) tends to indicate that the great *bāmā* sanctuary of Gibeon served as Saul's religious capital ...' This may be so, but Saul is linked overtly to **גִּבְעָה/נֶבֶעַן** in 1 Samuel, and **נֶבֶעַן** never appears in the book. See 2.1.

incapable of properly employing.²⁴⁰ Saul is neither military nor religious leader. David is both. Chronicles has not omitted 'superfluous details', a point also sustained by an examination of similar references to geographic phenomena in synoptic material in Samuel, Kings and Chronicles²⁴¹; rather, the early association of the ark with Baal(ah) Judah is transformed into a link between the ark and Gibeah in 1 Sam. 14.18 and 2 Sam. 6.3-4, and into a link between the ark and Kiriath-jearim in 1 Sam. 6.21-7.2 and 1 Chron. 13.5-6 (and also in Ps. 132.6). These tardy and rival traditions accentuate Saul's incapacity and indifference, respectively.²⁴²

3.1.3 The Participants' Identity and Number

David's entourage is elaborated greatly in 2 Sam. 6.1-5 in contrast to the focus on David in 6.12-20a, where the participants are mentioned briefly in v. 15 and then are presented in vv. 18-19 more as recipients of David's benevolence than as participants in his transfer of the ark. At the outset it is noteworthy that three times Chronicles has כל-ישראל in 1 Chron. 13.5-6, 8 in contrast to a fuller phrase in each parallel case in 2 Sam. 6.1-2, 5 (and the same is also true in 2 Sam. 6.15 // 1 Chron. 15.28).²⁴³

²⁴⁰ On the characterisation of Saul in 1 Samuel 14 see Jobling 1998: 94-95; V. P. Long 1989: 41.

²⁴¹ The construction noun + relative + preposition + noun is common in biblical Hebrew for supplying geographic information. The preposition is frequently either כ or מן. 76 legitimate examples of the construction were located in parallel chapters and 13 of these constitute actual verbal parallels. The only minus in Chronicles is in the present passage.

²⁴² It is observed in the discussion in 1.2.2 of 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2 that some explore the possibility that the canonically earlier story presupposes, foreshadows or reinterprets the later one. This writer agrees with this hypothesis. It seems likely that the story in 1 Samuel was composed as a preface once the story in 2 Samuel was already written. The evidence suggests to this writer that the ark was first associated with Baal(ah) Judah, later with Kiriath-jearim, and finally with Gibeah.

²⁴³ See appendix 1.

Most scholars think *בחור* was omitted in Chronicles thus producing an emphasis not found in the book's source. It is more probable, however, that *כל-ישראל* has undergone expansion in Samuel. This is suggested in part by the Hebrew variant *ב* which results in grammatical incongruity in the geographic phrase following *אסף*. The assembly of persons 'in', 'of', 'to' or 'from' geographic regions using the verbs *אסף*, *כנס*, *קבץ* and *קהל* is not articulated in biblical Hebrew by means of the preposition *ב*.²⁴⁴ Murray rightly divines the significance of Samuel's *בחור* in relationship to *אסף* and also *בקש*, and he also supplies an explanation for the enigmatic *עוד* following *אסף* (see 3.1.1.2)²⁴⁵:

'David *again* (*עוד*) gathered together all the élite troops...' To what does the temporal adverb refer back? The most obvious implicature is to a previous occasion when David had assembled such troops. But 5.17-25 has neither explicitly narrated nor implied David's gathering such a military force, nor has there been any previous reference to David's doing so in the David story in Samuel. The answer to the puzzle may lie in the resonant conjunction of the expressions 'picked Israelite troops' (6.1) and 'to search out David' (5.17) further back in two episodes from David's flight from Saul. In 1 Sam. 24:3[2]; 26.2 Saul deployed three thousand picked troops from the fight against the Philistines 'to search out David' (*לבקש את דוד*) in the Judean wilderness. Yet as things turned out on each occasion it was Saul's life that, put in jeopardy to David and his small personal band of fighters, was spared by David. Now in our present text the Philistines twice send a force 'to search out David' (*לבקש את דוד* 5.17a β ; cf. 5:22a), but it was they who were routed, by David and his personal band. Only following this defeat of the Philistines does 'David gather again all the élite troops in Israel', ten times Saul's 3000 (6.1). Thus the puzzling *עוד*, 'again', in 6.1 evidently has rather distant textual anaphora, back to 1 Sam. 24.3[2] and 26.2, as being the first subsequent gathering of picked troops noted in the narrative. But this reference so far back in the story would by itself be too distant and allusive to be effective. It is made effective, however, through the further connection strikingly forged by the phrase 'to search out David' (*לבקש את דוד*), a phrase which also links our passage to the same two earlier texts, and to nothing in between. This link creates narrative irony. For David has emerged unscathed from the Philistines come 'to seek his life', just as he had earlier from Saul. But more, with his small personal band David has now won the victory over the Philistines that Saul had failed to secure with Israel's élite troops.²⁴⁶

²⁴⁴ See appendix 1.

²⁴⁵ The root *בחר* is discussed further in 6.1.1.3.3.

²⁴⁶ Murray 1998: 114-116. An investigation of the verb *בקש* in Samuel reveals an interesting tale of 'seeker' and 'sought'. Saul and David are neither subject nor object in only two of 37 cases. There are eight

Chronicles' plus in 13.5 continues the broadness of the consultation in 13.1-4 and corresponds to the most extensive biblical depiction of the land. The land promised to Abraham (Gen. 15.18) and left unconquered by Joshua (Josh. 13.3) is now described according to the frontiers of Solomon's kingdom (1 Kgs. 8.65 // 2 Chron. 7.8). David and Israel turned Joshua's hope into reality—not after David's military crusades and at the end of his rule, but at the very start of his reign!

The 30,000 person army of MT 2 Sam. 6.1 pales into insignificance in light of the quantity of tribal troops in 1 Chronicles 12 and the military divisions in 1 Chronicles 27 and 2 Chronicles 17, and in the face of the enumeration of David's (1 Chron. 21.5), Rehoboam's (2 Chron. 11.1), Jeroboam's (2 Chron. 13.3), Asa's (2 Chron. 14.8), Amaziah's (2 Chron. 25.5), and Uzziah's (2 Chron. 26.13) armies. Therefore Samuel's figure would be inappropriate in 1 Chron. 13.5. The significance of Samuel's שלשים אלף should be construed in the context of Samuel, and Chronicles' מִן־שִׁיחֹר מִצָּרִים וְעַד־לְבֹא חֶמֶת in the context of Chronicles. Literarily, both descriptions fit their narrative contexts and thrusts appropriately.

Samuel's numerical figure is as tendentious as Chronicles' geographic description²⁴⁷ and must be considered either figurative or rhetorical.²⁴⁸ The number in 2

'seekers' in Samuel, and Saul is the subject in 23 of 37 cases, and there are ten 'sought' in Samuel, and David is the object in 23 of 37 cases. There are five purposes for seeking in Samuel, and destruction or killing is the topic in 27 of 37 cases. Saul seeks to destroy David (16 times), and find donkeys (three times) and enlist David (once) and consult a medium (once) and destroy Abiathar (once) and the Gibeonites (once). David seeks Yahweh's mercy (twice), and to destroy Saul's assassin (once) but not Saul himself (once).

²⁴⁷ See the note in 1.3.3. The view that early Israel numbered two to three million people (based on Exod. 12.37; 38.26; Num. 1.46; 2.32; 11.21; 26.51) and that Palestine was the home of fifteen to twenty million people (based on Deut. 7.1) is fictional. See Grabbe 2000. Current demographic estimates for the population of Palestine are 150,000 for the Middle Bronze Age, 60,000-70,000 for the Late Bronze Age, and 50,000-150,000 at the start and 400,000-600,000 at the peak of the Iron Age (Broshi and Gophna 1986: 73-90; Finkelstein 1988: 334, 341, 355; Gonen 1984: 61-73; Gophna and Portugali 1988: 11-28).

Sam. 6.1 may intend to evoke Numbers' and Joshua's cultic armies, or accentuate the ark's religious significance, or glorify David's rise to power from an original base of just 600 men (1 Sam. 23.13; 27.2; 30.9). However, the compositional significance of שלשים אלף may be appreciated more fully. The numbers three, 30, 300, 3000, 30,000 and 300,000 are above all associated with military forces, and especially warfare between the Israelites and Philistines.²⁴⁹ There are three battle companies (1 Sam. 11.1; 13.17), three fighting sons (1 Sam. 17.13-14; 31.6, 8; 2 Sam. 2.18), and 'the Three' and 'the Thirty' warriors (2 Sam. 23.9, 13, 16-19, 22-24), and there are also the following:

- 1 Sam. 4.10 The Philistines fell 30,000 Israelites in battle.
- 1 Sam. 11.8 Saul musters 300,000 (MT) / 600,000 (4QSam^a, OG, OL) / 700,000 (Josephus) from Israel and 30,000 (MT) / 70,000 (4QSam^a, OG, OL, Josephus) from Judah to fight the Ammonites.
- 1 Sam. 13.2 Saul chooses 3000 to fight the Philistines.
- 1 Sam. 13.5 The Philistines muster 30,000 (MT, LXX^B) / 3000 (LXX^L, Peshitta) chariots and 6000 horsemen to fight Israel.
- 1 Sam. 24.3 Saul assembles 3000 to pursue David.
- 1 Sam. 26.2 Saul assembles 3000 to pursue David.
- 2 Sam. 6.1 David assembles 30,000 (MT) / 70,000 (OG, OL) following his defeat of the Philistines.²⁵⁰

The versional evidence suggests that 70,000 was revised to 30,000 in MT 2 Sam. 6.1. The assimilation or harmonisation to 30,000 also has figurative or rhetorical significance in the book of Samuel. David's 30,000 is the number of Israelites killed when the Philistines

²⁴⁸ The historical reliability of this and many other large numbers must be rejected, as well as attempts to explain them by means of mathematical formulae or by interpreting אלף as 'troop' or 'unit' rather than 'thousand'. The occurrence and role of large numbers in the Bible is paralleled in Sumerian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Hittite and Egyptian royal inscriptions and military annals. See Fouts 1992, 1994, 1997.

²⁴⁹ See, e.g., Josh. 7.3-4; 8.3; Judg. 7.6-8, 16, 22; 8.4; 15.11; 16.27; 1 Chron. 11.11, 20; 2 Chron. 14.8; 17.14; 25.5. Only verses with the numbers 3000, 30,000 and 300,000 are given here.

²⁵⁰ On Josephus' reading see Begg 1997: 14. A comprehensive review of all numbers containing שלשים אלף / τριάκοντα χιλιάδας and שבעים אלף / ἑβδομήκοντα χιλιάδας in the Hebrew and Greek versions of the Bible shows that the Greek version is not inclined to exaggerate numbers in the *Vorlage* and neither does it have a special interest in the particular number 'seven' or multiples thereof. Similarly, a thorough assessment of all instances of מאה/מאות and אלפים/אלף in synoptic passages in Samuel, Kings and Chronicles with attention to the versions shows that these books are equally prone to contain difficulties and disparities in numerical expression. The data supporting these conclusions, which the writer brings together in an unpublished essay entitled 'Large Numbers in Samuel, Kings and Chronicles', cannot be duplicated here.

most common in Judges and Samuel, and once again, the construction usually expresses accompaniment in battle situations. The similarity between 1 Sam. 14.20 and 2 Sam. 6.2 is remarkable, especially in light of Saul's request for the ark in MT 1 Sam. 14.18:

1 Sam. 14.20	וַיִּזְעַק שָׁאוּל וְכָל־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ
2 Sam. 6.2	וַיָּקָם וַיֵּלֶךְ דָּוִד וְכָל־הָעָם אֲשֶׁר אִתּוֹ

Finally, the phrase כָּל־הָעָם in 2 Sam. 6.2's plus occurs at the beginning of a concentric structure which ends with David's blessing 'the people' (הָעָם; 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2), David's gift of food to 'all the people' (כָּל־הָעָם; 2 Sam. 6.19a; cf. 1 Chron. 16.3), and the return of 'all the people' (כָּל־הָעָם; 2 Sam. 6.19b // 1 Chron. 16.43a) to their homes.²⁵³ Again, is Chronicles' כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל *really* the result of the book's pan-Israel interest?

3.1.3.4	2 Sam. 6.5	וַיָּדוּד וְכָל־בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל
	1 Chron. 13.8	וַיָּדוּד וְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל

According to Williamson 'This change is in line with the Chronicler's practice of avoiding terminology which might be confused with that used elsewhere in the Bible for the later political division'.²⁵⁴ This generalised statement must be doubted for both textual and literary reasons.²⁵⁵ First, the shortness of 'all Israel' (Chronicles) vis-à-vis 'all the house of Israel' (MT and Peshitta Samuel), 'the sons of Israel' (LXX^{AB} Samuel and the Syro-Hexaplar), and 'all the sons of Israel' (4QSam^a, LXX^L Samuel and Jacob of Edessa), suggests that the reading in Chronicles is pristine and that the other witnesses contain independent expansions.²⁵⁶ Second, some scholars emend MT 2 Sam. 6.5 to 'all the sons of Israel' whereas others deem the entire verse a late addition to the story based in part on 'all the house of Israel' which they consider anachronistic. It is interesting that בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל

²⁵³ Murray 1998: 146 thinks כָּל־הָעָם, יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, and the assembly and dispersal of the participants form an inclusio between vv. 1-2 and 18-20.

²⁵⁴ Williamson 1977: 109; cf. Japhet 1997: 271.

²⁵⁵ See appendix 1 and 5.1.2.2.

²⁵⁶ McKenzie 1984: 48.

occurs 125 times in the Latter Prophets (81 times in Ezekiel; 20 times in Jeremiah; 24 times elsewhere), eight times in the Pentateuch (five times in Leviticus; twice in Exodus; once in Numbers) and four times in the Writings (three times in Psalms; once in Ruth). In the Former Prophets the phrase occurs in Josh. 21.25 and 1 Kgs. 12.21; 20.31 and seven times in Samuel, where the textual evidence for the occurrences is striking. כל־בית ישראל appears four times in the stories about the ark (1 Sam. 7.2-3; 2 Sam. 6.5, 15) and בית ישראל occurs three times in the context of the dynasty of Saul (2 Sam. 1.12; 12.8; 16.3). Furthermore, in both 2 Sam. 12.8 and 16.3 MT's בית ישראל is probably secondary to בנות Furthermore, in both 2 Sam. 12.8 and 16.3 MT's בני ישראל and בני ישראל, respectively.²⁵⁷ Gelandier aptly comments:

A key phrase for both episodes [Uzzah and Michal] is בִּרְךָ (to bless), vss. 11, 12, 18, 20 generally appearing alongside בית (house), in vss. 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 21. There may also be a connection between the motif בִּרְךָ בית (bless the house) and the unusual phrase בית ישראל (house of Israel) which appears here twice, in vss. 5 and 15. This may be intended to stress the blessing brought by David, particularly in contrast to the house of Saul, hinted at in the phrase 'above your father and above all his house' (2 Sam. 6:21).²⁵⁸

3.1.4 The Participants' Performance

The agreement among the versions regarding מִשְׁחָקִים/παίζοντες in 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 stands out against the textual uncertainties in the second half of the story (2 Sam. 6.14, 16 // 1 Chron. 15.27, 29 and 2 Sam. 6.20b-22) where David's precise activities are unclear. Other details in 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 are not so straightforward.

²⁵⁷ McCarter 1984: 295, 368 argues that, e.g., the Peshitta's כְּתָבָה and כְּתָבָה, reflect the original Hebrew.

²⁵⁸ Gelandier 1991: 47. The contrast between בית דוד and בית שאול is prominent in 2 Samuel 3, and 'house of Saul' occurs elsewhere only in 2 Sam. 9.1-3; 16.5, 8; 19.18. Not only Caird 1953: 1078 considers Samuel's כל־בית ישראל 'an editorial exaggeration'.

The prepositional phrase לפני (or מפני or מלפני) followed by יהוה appears 251 times, including 24 times in Samuel, 14 times in Kings, and 19 times in Chronicles. The phrase followed by (ה)אלהים occurs 24 times, including five times in Chronicles, but never in Samuel and Kings. It is remarkable that Chronicles does not dislike 'before Yahweh' which it uses twelve times in non-synoptic material²⁵⁹, has as a plus in one synoptic verse²⁶⁰, and shares five times in synoptic material.²⁶¹ This evidence and additional evidence in appendix 2 suggest that Chronicles' two minuses and two variant readings 'before God' in the story of David's transfer of the ark are not tendentious adjustments.

In 1 Samuel 'King' Saul never acts לפני יהוה, but others do: the Israelites, Samuel's parents Hannah and Elkanah, the prophet Samuel, the priest Ahimelech, Saul's servant Doeg the Edomite, Saul's son Jonathan, and David.²⁶² The evidence from 2 Samuel and from synoptic material in 1 Chronicles is summarised in the following table:

2 Sam. 5.3 // 1 Chron. 11.3	S and C have לפני יהוה
2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8	S has לפני יהוה; C has לפני האלהים
2 Sam. 6.7 // 1 Chron. 13.10	S has לפני ארון האלהים; C has לפני אלהים ²⁶³
2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27	S has לפני יהוה in a plus
2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29	S has לפני יהוה in a plus
2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1	S has לפני יהוה; C has לפני האלהים
[Ps. 96.13 //] 1 Chron. 16.33	C [and Psalms] has לפני יהוה
2 Sam. 6.21	S has לפני יהוה twice
2 Sam. 7.18 // 1 Chron. 17.16	S and C have לפני יהוה
2 Sam. 21.9	S has לפני יהוה

²⁵⁹ 1 Chron. 16.33; 22.18; 23.13, 31; 29.22; 2 Chron. 1.6; 14.12; 19.2; 20.13, 18; 27.6; 31.20.

²⁶⁰ 2 Kgs. 21.22 // 2 Chron. 33.23.

²⁶¹ 2 Sam. 5.3 // 1 Chron. 11.3; 2 Sam. 7.18 // 1 Chron. 17.16; 1 Kgs. 8.62 // 2 Chron. 7.4; 1 Kgs. 22.21 // 2 Chron. 18.20; 2 Kgs. 23.3 // 2 Chron. 34.31.

²⁶² See appendix 2. לפני יהוה appears in 1 Sam. 1.12, 15, 19; 6.20; 7.6; 10.19, 25; 11.15 (twice); 12.7; 15.33; 21.7 (מלפני), 8; 23.18; 26.19.

²⁶³ Greek Samuel has a doublet, the first member in semi-agreement with MT Samuel and the second member in agreement with Chronicles. See appendix 2.

In 2 Samuel David conducts himself לפני יהוה (2 Sam. 5.3; 6.5, 14, 16, 17, 21; 7.18) at the expense of Saul and his sons (2 Sam. 6.21; 21.9). On one hand, Chronicles does not have an aversion to לפני יהוה, and on the other, Samuel wishes to emphasise David's conduct לפני יהוה. The distribution of the theological adverbial לפני יהוה in Samuel, including its appearance in adjustments and supplements, the concentration of the phrase in 2 Samuel 6, and its repetition at the boundaries of 2 Sam. 6.21, are not chance occurrences.

3.1.4.2	2 Sam. 6.5 1 Chron. 13.8	// בכל עצי ברושים בכל־עו ובשירים
---------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------

MT Samuel's בכל עצי ברושים can be translated by 'with all (sorts of) conifer wood(-instrument)s'²⁶⁴ and Chronicles' and 4QSam^a's בכל־עו ובשירים by 'with great exuberance and with songs'.²⁶⁵ Nevertheless, the consensus among scholars is that (1) MT Samuel is unintelligibly corrupt, and that (2) MT Chronicles retains the most pristine form of the original text, and that (3) MT Chronicles should *perhaps* be emended to בכלי עו ובשירים, 'with sonorous instruments and songs'²⁶⁶, by the simple addition of a ך to בכל, and that (4) either בכל עו ובשירים or בכלי עו ובשירים is the original reading in Samuel and in the *Vorlage* of Chronicles. Chronicles' present text may show the accidental omission of ך from an original בכלי, but MT Samuel's text is not the result of *scribal errors* alone: the omission of ך, the orthographic confusion of ך and ץ, the orthographic confusion of ך and ך as well as the placement of the mistaken reading, the metathesis of ש and ך, and the orthographic confusion of ך and ך. MT Samuel's text must reflect at least some intentional modification.

²⁶⁴ Wright 2002: 204. The exact family, genus and species of ברוש is unknown, so 'conifer' is appropriate. Other translations are 'cypress', 'juniper', 'fir' and 'pine'. Modern English translations, except for the ASV, JPS, KJV, NASB and NKJV, emend MT Samuel.

²⁶⁵ Wright 2002: 204.

²⁶⁶ McCarter 1984: 164.

Greek Chronicles has ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ ἐν ψαλτωδοῖς which aligns well with Chronicles' and 4QSam^a's בכל-עו ובשרים. Greek Samuel has ἐν ὀργάνοις ἡρμουςμένοις (LXX^A καὶ) ἐν ἰσχύι καὶ ἐν ᾠδαῖς, which may be rendered 'on well-tuned instruments mightily and melodically'. This text-string provides the clue for deciphering the history of Samuel's wording. The first and second prepositional phrases in Greek Samuel are a double reading in which each element corresponds to MT Samuel's בכל עצי, and the third prepositional phrase in Greek Samuel corresponds to MT Samuel's ברושים.²⁶⁷

Greek Samuel	MT Samuel	Chronicles and 4QSam ^a
ἐν ὀργάνοις ἡρμουςμένοις	בכל עצי	
(καὶ) ἐν ἰσχύι	בכל עצי	בכל-עו // ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει
καὶ ἐν ᾠδαῖς	ברושים	ובשרים // καὶ ἐν ψαλτωδοῖς

Ulrich argues that this is one of six instances in 2 Samuel 6 of hebraising revision by a 'later translator' or the *'kaige* recensionist' in which the general practice of the reviser is to prefix to the preserved OG translation his approximation toward MT:

... the latter member ἐν ἰσχυι καὶ ἐν ᾠδαις clearly reflects 4Q C (omitting כל). The former member (also omitting כל), is enigmatic (cf. 6:14 where ἐν ὀργανοις ἡρμουςμενοις = בכל עז [?] ...), but G is apparently attempting to reflect a plural construct chain (= M), not a conjoined pair (= 4Q C).²⁶⁸

Chronicles' and 4QSam^a's בכל-עו ובשרים is primary and MT Samuel's בכל עצי ברושים is secondary²⁶⁹, yet the latter is meaningful²⁷⁰ and its provenance and role in the

²⁶⁷ Alternatively, does Greek Samuel's ἐν ὀργάνοις ἡρμουςμένοις in 2 Sam. 6.5, 14 reflect בכלי נעים or כלים נעים? Observe כנור נעים / ψαλτήριον τερπνόν in Ps. 81.3 (LXX 80.3). For the adjective נעים see also 2 Sam. 1.23; 23.1; Ps. 16.6, 11; 81.3; 133.1; 135.3; 147.1; Job 36.11; Prov. 22.18; 23.8; 24.4; Cant. 1.16.

²⁶⁸ Ulrich 1978: 198; cf. 197-202; cf. Keil and Delitzsch 1866: 331. Some believe Samuel's ἐν ὀργάνοις ἡρμουςμένοις (LXX^A καὶ) ἐν ἰσχύι conflates בכל עז and בכל עו (e.g., Driver 1890: 266; Herbert 1997b: 123-124; McCarter 1984: 163-164; McKenzie 1984: 48-49; Rehm 1937: 26). However, Murray 1998: 57 correctly points out that בכל עז would have been rendered by either ἐν ὀργάνοις ἰσχύος or ἐν ὀργάνοις ἰσχυροῖς.

²⁶⁹ Most take this view, e.g., Wright 2002: 204-207. Soggin 1964: 377 emends MT Samuel to בכל עצי ברושים by the addition of ץ.

²⁷⁰ MT Samuel's בכל עצי ברושים is retained *in toto* as the *lectio difficilior* by Barthélemy 1982: 242; Bergen 1996: 329; Seow 1989: 97 n. 51.

canonical book of Samuel *should* be explored. The roots עז and שיר do not play a significant role in Samuel and the Former Prophets in comparison with Chronicles²⁷¹, but עצי ברוש is prominent in Solomon's temple building narratives²⁷², and notably in the form עצי ברושים in 2 Sam. 6.5 does not have the same referent as it does in the aforementioned passages, but 'May there not be hidden behind the language of TM and Pesh. a reminiscence of that cultic practice which exercised such a powerful literary influence upon 2 Sam. 6?'²⁷³.

3.1.4.3	2 Sam. 6.5 1 Chron. 13.8	ובכנרות ובנבלים ובתפים ובמנענעים ובצלצלים // ובכנרות ובנבלים ובתפים ובמצלות ובחצצרות
---------	-----------------------------	---

Samuel and Chronicles disagree on the latter word pair. By consensus Chronicles substitutes מצלות and חצצרות for Samuel's מנענעים (2 Sam. 6.5) and צלצלים (2 Sam. 6.5; twice in Ps. 150.5) because Samuel's terms are exceptional whereas the others are common in Chronicles: מצלות occurs 11 times, and elsewhere once in each of Ezra and Nehemiah; חצצרה occurs 16 times, and elsewhere five times in Numbers, three times in Kings, twice in Nehemiah, and once in each of Hosea, Psalms and Ezra. However, this approach has problems. (1) The terms in Hebrew and Greek Chronicles line up well, but

²⁷¹ Both עז and שיר are developed more fully in Chronicles. Chronicles uses the noun עז I ('strength') most often (6 times; 1 Chron. 13.8; 16.11, 27-28; 2 Chron. 6.41; 30.21) following only Psalms (31 times), Proverbs (9 times) and Ezekiel (8 times), whereas Samuel only has it twice (1 Sam. 2.10; 2 Sam. 6.14). The adjective עז occurs in 2 Sam. 22.18 but not in Chronicles, and the verb עוז occurs in neither book. On the theme עז in Chronicles see Johnstone 1997: I, 322. Chronicles uses the noun שיר most often (14 times; 1 Chron. 6.16-17; 13.8; 15.16; 16.42; 25.6-7; 2 Chron. 5.13; 7.6; 23.13, 18; 29.27-28; 34.12) following only Psalms (42 times), whereas Samuel does not have the noun. However, Samuel does have the noun שירה in 2 Sam. 22.1 and the verb שיר in 1 Sam. 18.6 and 2 Sam. 19.36. Chronicles also uses the verb שיר (17 times; 1 Chron. 6.18; 9.33; 15.16, 19, 27; 16.9, 23; 2 Chron. 5.12-13; 9.11; 20.21; 23.13; 29.28; 35.15, 25), equal to the number of occurrences in Nehemiah, and following only Psalms (27 times).

²⁷² 1 Kgs. 5.22, 24; 6.15, 34; 9.11; 2 Chron. 2.7; 3.5. ברוש occurs elsewhere in 2 Kgs. 19.23; Ps. 104.17, and also ten times in the Latter Prophets. Compare ברוה in Cant. 1.17.

²⁷³ Carlson 1964: 64; cf. 77. Seow 1989: 97 n. 51 thinks עצי ברושים is a cognate of Akkadian *burāšu*, 'crushed wood' or 'wood shavings', used in rituals.

Greek Samuel does not reflect מנענעים, and αὐλός generally stands for חליל. (2) The agreement of צלצלים/מצלותים/κύμβαλον in all versions of Samuel and Chronicles shows that Chronicles also does not reflect מנענעים, but there is partial agreement between Greek Samuel (αὐλός) and Hebrew and Greek Chronicles (חצצרה and σάλπιγξ) on the inclusion of wind instruments. The differences between MT Samuel and MT Chronicles are not due to simple substitution. (3) The affiliation of 4QSam^a's text is uncertain, and Herbert raises the possibility of an additional musical instrument in 4QSam^a.²⁷⁴ (4) Many assert that Chronicles' מצלותים is a late equivalent for Samuel's צלצלים, but צלצלים in 2 Sam. 6.5 and twice in Ps. 150.5 can also be construed as a late term.²⁷⁵ (5) Several scholars notice the absence of aerophones from MT 2 Sam. 6.5, and Wright considers this sufficiently troublesome to conclude that they are nevertheless present in the first procession even if not to the degree that they are in the second.²⁷⁶ (6) It is a logical fallacy to conclude that a term which is frequent in Chronicles and on occasion stands opposite an uncommon term in Samuel or Kings is substituted because of ordinariness. This *could be* the case, but frequency can only *suggest the probability* of such a substitution. Both מצלותים and חצצרה occur first in Chronicles in 1 Chron. 13.8 and perhaps these initial (and original?) occurrences prompt the independent large-scale inclusion of both instruments in Chronicles' non-synoptic supplements dealing with music (1 Chronicles 15–16, 25; 2 Chronicles 5, 13, 15, 20, 29).²⁷⁷ These issues make it impossible to know the earliest wording in 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8.

²⁷⁴ Fincke 2001: 149; Herbert 1997b: 124.

²⁷⁵ See appendix 3.

²⁷⁶ Wright 2002: 208–209, 214–215.

²⁷⁷ Elsewhere Kings and Chronicles share חצצרות twice in 2 Kgs. 11.14 // 2 Chron. 23.13 and Chronicles has a minus of Kings' clause with חצצרות in 2 Kgs. 12.14 // 2 Chron. 24.14.

3.1.5 The Attendants' Identity and Position

3.1.5.1 2 Sam. 6.3

ועזא ואחיו בני אבינדב //

1 Chron. 13.7

ועוד ואחרי

Five persons have the name עוזה/עוזא ('Uzzah'), a hypocoristic or shortened theophoric name for עזיה/עזיאל or עזראל. Three persons have the name אחיו ('Ahio') which some suggest is similarly short for אחיה or אחיהו. Most scholars retain MT's punctuation (אַחִיו) although some re-point the consonants as אָחִיו ('his brother') or אַחֵיו ('his brothers' cf. οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ in Greek Samuel and Chronicles). The textual implications favour the view that אחיו is the proper name 'Ahio'. Three persons have the name אבינדרב ('Abinadab') and in this context Uzzah and Ahio are called בני אבינדרב, understood to mean 'sons' rather than 'grandsons' of Abinadab. It is pointless to discuss here the literary and historical difficulties related to the identification of Uzzah and Ahio.²⁷⁸ The pragmatic assumptions are that בית אבינדרב refers to a temple or a complex containing a temple and that בני אבינדרב serves to authenticate Uzzah's and Ahio's appropriate cultic status. In light of this fact it is remarkable that 1 Chron. 13.7 has בית אבינדרב but not בני אבינדרב. Furthermore, an investigation of similar descriptions based on formal criteria suggests that בני אבינדרב defining Uzzah and Ahio would not have been omitted if it had stood in Chronicles' *Vorlage*. There are 86 statements of personal identification in parallel passages in Samuel–Kings and Chronicles that consist of 'proper noun + X + proper noun' in which the proper nouns are not Israel or Ammon and in which X is any of אב, אב, בן/בת, אש, איש or אחות/אח. In summary: 55 times Samuel–Kings and Chronicles share an identical phrase or a similar phrase involving an orthographical difference, a substitution, or a smaller or larger number of words; 15 times the parallel in Samuel–Kings and Chronicles

²⁷⁸ Are they sons or grandsons of Abinadab? Are Uzzah and Eleazar brothers or one and the same person? Is זאדוק an obscure reference to Zadok? What implications does the seemingly long period of time between 1 Sam. 7.2 and 2 Sam. 6.1 have for the identification of these characters? See the commentaries and also Brettler 1992b; Edelman 1992; Propp 1992; Ramsey 1992; Thompson 1992b.

is inexact or uncertain; 4 times Chronicles has a plus; 12 times Samuel–Kings has a plus: 8 of the 12 revolve around figures who are clearly defined or known contextually, or who appear in non-parallel material in Samuel–Kings, or other issues related to shared/non-shared material are involved²⁷⁹; 3 of the 12 are complicated and arguments can go in either direction.²⁸⁰ This instance of Samuel's plus and Chronicles' minus does not tally well with the data just mentioned. Consequently, the burden of proof falls on scholars who suggest that Chronicles has gratuitously omitted the phrase.²⁸¹ The description בני אבינר is literarily significant in Samuel, and potentially so in Chronicles, because it serves to authenticate Uzzah's and Ahio's appropriate cultic status, and in so doing it also implicates Uzzah (the rhetorically foregrounded character in 2 Sam. 6.3) rather than David for cultic negligence or Yahweh for inexplicable caprice in MT 2 Sam. 6.6-7. Uzzah should have known better!

3.1.5.2	2 Sam. 6.3	// ועז ואחיו נהגים את־העגלה חדשה
	1 Chron. 13.7	ועז ואחיו נהגים בעגלה
	2 Sam. 6.4	ואחיו הלך לפני הארון
	2 Sam. 6.7	עם ארון האלהים
	1 Chron. 13.10	לפני אלהים

The disjunctive construction ועז ואחיו ... נהגים in 2 Sam. 6.3 // 1 Chron. 13.7 introduces background information which vivifies the story and prepares the reader for subsequent events. The details in 2 Sam. 6.3, 6 // 1 Chron. 13.7, 9 allow the following reconstruction using extra-biblical data: the ark is on a two-wheel flat-bed wood cart, drawn by a pair of oxen, each ox with a yoke harness attached to either side of a long pole

²⁷⁹ 2 Sam. 3.3 // 1 Chron. 3.1; 2 Sam. 3.5 // 1 Chron. 3.3; 1 Kgs. 12.21 // 2 Chron. 11.1; 1 Kgs. 15.1 // 2 Chron. 13.1; 1 Kgs. 15.18 // 2 Chron. 16.2; 2 Kgs. 11.2 // 2 Chron. 22.11; 2 Kgs. 18.1 // 2 Chron. 29.1; 2 Kgs. 23.34 // 2 Chron. 36.4.

²⁸⁰ 2 Sam. 8.3 // 2 Chron. 18.3; 2 Sam. 23.18 // 1 Chron. 11.20; 2 Kgs. 22.3 // 2 Chron. 34.8.

²⁸¹ The writer suggests in 3.1.2.3 that בית אבינר is interpolated in 1 Chron. 13.7 from 2 Sam. 6.3. In view of the present discussion the interpolation was likely completed prior to the insertion of בני אבינר in 2 Sam. 6.3.

extending forward from the cart, and each ox with a nose-ring to which a cord is attached, and which Uzzah and Ahio hold as they guide (נהגים) the oxen, cart and ark along the road.

Scholarship maintains that MT 2 Sam. 6.3-4 contains a classic example of dittography through homoioteleuton, in which the second עגלה gave rise to the accidental insertion of the first חדשה (after the first עגלה) together with the repetition of the following וישאֹהוּ מבית אבינדב אשר בגבעה. Indeed, the MT reflects several difficulties in its current form: (1) a tautologous report of the נשא-ing of the ark; (2) an obvious case of grammatical disagreement in the second העגלה חדשה; (3) distant anaphora for the suffix of the second וישאֹהוּ; and (4) the words following the presumed dittography, עם ארון האלהים, cannot be made to fit on to the repeated clause; that is, it is illogical to say: 'They brought *it* [*the ark*] out of Abinadab's בית, which is בגבעה, *with the ark* of God'.

After eliminating the presumed dittograph, the MT reads:

וירכבו את־ארון האלהים אל־עגלה חדשה
וישאֹהוּ מבית אבינדב אשר בגבעה
ועזא ואחיו בני אבינדב נהגים את־העגלה [חדשה]
[וישאֹהוּ מבית אבינדב אשר בגבעה]
עם ארון האלהים
ואחיו הלך לפני הארון

This emended text has *additional* difficulties²⁸²: (1) The combination ועזא ואחיו בני אבינדב is unidiomatic; rather, one might expect a clause containing the preposition על, such as ... את־העגלה אשר ארון האלהים עליה ('... the cart on which was the ark of God'). (2) The omission of any comment on the position of Uzzah is striking. The MT points out that Ahio is located לפני הארון but where is Uzzah, who is the principal character in v. 6? In view of these problems some scholars suggest the insertion of ועזא prior to לפני הארון הלך: 'And Uzzah was walking beside God's ark and Ahio was walking before the ark'.

²⁸² Murray 1998: 56-57.

The emended MT also fails to do justice to other versional evidence. LXX^L Samuel's καὶ Οζα ... ἐπορεύοντο is often used to generate the phrase ועזא הלך with which scholars emend MT to ועזא הלך עם ארון האלהים, and LXX^L Samuel's καὶ ἐκ πλαγίων τῆς κιβωτοῦ is usually considered an independent adjustment to clarify the attendants' position vis-à-vis the ark or to stress their care for the ark. Contrary to these *ad hoc* corrections of MT, LXX^L's ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ἐκ πλαγίων is a doublet which conflates two originally independent prepositional phrases: ἔμπροσθεν stands for לפני and ἐκ πλαγίων corresponds to לעמם.²⁸³ Trebolle Barrera argues that the textual evidence in Hebrew and Greek 2 Sam. 6.3-4, 7 // 1 Chron. 13.7, 10 attests three traditions regarding the role of Uzzah and Ahio²⁸⁴:

The brothers conducted the cart.	ועזא ואחיו נהגים את/ב העגלה
The brothers marched in front of the ark.	ועזא ואחיו הלכ[ו/ים] לפני הארון
The brothers marched beside the ark.	ועזא ואחיו הלכ[ו/ים] לעמם הארון

The first tradition is primary. Chronicles has this tradition alone, and it is also reflected in all versions of Samuel. Consequently, 'C appears to contain the most pristine text in this passage²⁸⁵, with the exception of מבית אבינדב which is probably interpolated from Samuel (3.1.2.3).²⁸⁶ 4QSam^a clearly shares the longer form of the text, but its exact wording is uncertain.²⁸⁷ The pluses and minuses in Greek Samuel attest forms of the received text at various stages in its composition, although the Greek versions also reflect the hands of their own editors. In the first half of 2 Sam. 6.4 it is impossible to determine with certainty the sequence of the gradual supplementation with וישארו מבית אבינדב אשר, חדשה, האלהים and עם ארון, בגבעה. LXX^A is revised toward MT with τῇ καὶ ἡραν αὐτὴν ἀπὸ οἴκου Αμιναδαβ ἐν βουνῷ, and LXX^L is revised with τοῦ θεοῦ. In the latter half of

²⁸³ See appendix 3.

²⁸⁴ See Trebolle Barrera 1989a: 98-100; 1992c: 320-321.

²⁸⁵ McKenzie 1984: 48.

²⁸⁶ See appendix 3 on אֶת־הָעֵגְלָה versus בָּעֵגְלָה.

²⁸⁷ Fincke 2001: 148-149; Herbert 1997b: 121.

2 Sam. 6.4 the *earliest supplement* to the story was probably לעמדת [ו/ים] יעזא ואחיו הלכ. LXX^B was revised in full whereas LXX^L was revised in part with the insertion of ἔμπροσθεν only, thus creating the double reading in LXX^L. LXX^A is incoherent.

Originally, the brothers were the conductors of the oxen, cart and ark. Later, biblical editors positioned the brothers beside the ark in order to account for the fate of Uzzah. Finally, editors took Ahio away and stationed him in front of the ark so as to explain his survival and shield his character. These editors simultaneously made the story unclear with respect to Uzzah's location. This remarkable ambiguity entices scholars to emend MT Samuel, but its editorial intention encourages the reader to doubt Uzzah's adherence to his role and ultimately Uzzah's confidence in the deity's self-sufficiency. Again, the homicide in 2 Sam. 6.7 is not the result of David's cultic negligence or Yahweh's inexplicable caprice. Rather, Uzzah's 'unfaith' proved fateful.

3.1.6 The Ark's Epithets

3.1.6.1	1 Chron. 13.5	את־ארון האלהים
	2 Sam. 6.3	// את־ארון האלהים
	1 Chron. 13.7	את־ארון האלהים
	2 Sam. 6.4	עם ארון האלהים
	2 Sam. 6.4	הארון

See appendix 2.

3.1.6.2	2 Sam. 6.2	את ארון האלהים אשר־נקרא שם שם יהוה צבאות ישב הכרבים עליו //
	1 Chron. 13.6	ארון האלוהים יהוה ישב הכרובים אשר־נקרא שם

The construction שם ... נקרא (in this order or reversed) occurs 33 times, 20 times outside an אשר clause either with (nine times) or without (11 times) an על element, and thirteen times within an אשר clause that functions to characterise more precisely an

antecedent. With regard to the second type of clause, on 11 occasions the construction occurs with an על element and consists of the following parts:

X אשר נקרא שם Y על Z

- (1) an antecedent main subject (X)
- (2) followed by a sub-clause introduced with the relative pronoun אשר and containing
- (3) the verb נקרא and
- (4) the embedded subject שם with a pronominal suffix (Y) and
- (5) the preposition על with a resumptive pronominal suffix (Z) referring back to the main subject (X)

2 Sam. 6.2 is exceptional among the 11 examples because the embedded subject שם lacks the pronominal suffix Y and is duplicated and because there is a noticeably long interval between the שם and 'על Z' elements.²⁸⁸ Again with regard to the second type of clause, on one occasion the construction occurs without the 'על Z' element (Dan. 10.1), and in 1 Chron. 13.6 the construction occurs without both the Y and 'על Z' elements. The expression 'על ... שם ... נקרא' (in this order or another) denotes ownership and/or authority over places or people(s), and over an object in the case of the ark.²⁸⁹ Therefore, the absence of the 'על Z' element makes 1 Chron. 13.6 exceptional.²⁹⁰ In view of these stylistic incongruities, and other difficulties highlighted below, it is proposed that the earlier text common to both Samuel and Chronicles was אֲשֶׁר נִקְרָא שָׁם ('which happened to be there'; קרא II [cf. קרה I]). Ehrlich's brilliant suggestion, developed further by

²⁸⁸ The antecedent main subject (X) is the temple in Jer. 7.10, 11, 14, 30; 32.34; 34.15; Jerusalem in Jer. 25.29; Dan. 9.18; the Israelite people in 2 Chron. 7.14; the gentile nations in Amos 9.12; and the ark in 2 Sam. 6.2.

²⁸⁹ BDB 1027-1028; Coppes 1980b: 810; Jonker 1997: 973.

²⁹⁰ The phrase in Dan. 10.1 is an interpolation (e.g., Hartman and Di Lella 1978: 13-14, 255), and it is also semantically distinct in that it does not denote ownership and/or authority.

Seeligmann, and adopted by Japhet, supplies a plausible origin for the present textforms.²⁹¹

Most are convinced that 2 Sam. 6.2 has undergone interpolation. Accordingly they retain none of יהוה ישב הכרבים עליו or keep only יהוה עליו or יהוה ישב הכרבים עליו. The literary evidence against the primitive use of יהוה צבאות is substantial²⁹², and historical and theological factors also weigh heavily against the views that יהוה צבאות originated in the pre-Jerusalem cultus at Shiloh (cf. 1 Sam. 1.3, 11) and that the formula יהוה צבאות ישב הכרבים (1 Sam. 4.4; 2 Sam. 6.2) is the earliest or official epithet of the ark.²⁹³ Additional difficulties with 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6 are: (1) the different placement of יהוה [צבאות] י[ו]שב הכר[ו]נים in Samuel and Chronicles; (2) the absence of צבאות from 4QSam^{a294}, and from Chronicles, in spite of the fact that the word appears in 2 Sam. 5.10 // 1 Chron. 11.9 and 2 Sam. 7.8, 26 // 1 Chron. 17.7, 24 (but not in

²⁹¹ Ehrlich 1910: 286; Japhet 1993: 278; Seeligmann 1961: 204-205. Sasson 2000 uses the versions injudiciously and he is insensitive to 'Hebrew idiomatics' in spite of his claim to the contrary. He naïvely 'go[es] back to the Masoretic text'.

²⁹² The usage of יהוה (אלהים) צבאות is conspicuous. It is distributed unevenly and is strongly associated with prophetic speech. יהוה צבאות occurs 259 times: ten times in Samuel; two times in Kings; three times in Chronicles; eight times in Psalms; and 236 times in the Latter prophets, notably 77 times in Jeremiah, 62 times in Isaiah, 53 times in Zechariah, 24 times in Malachi, and 14 times in Haggai. יהוה אלהים צבאות occurs 19 times: one time in Samuel; two times in Kings; five times in Jeremiah; six times in Amos; and five times in Psalms. Interestingly, צבאות (אלהים) צבאות appears 82 times in MT Jeremiah, but only 12 occurrences are reflected in the shorter and more authentic Greek version, and perhaps only six are original (cf. Olofsson 1990: 122-124).

²⁹³ Albertz 1994: I, 132, 300 n. 31 says: 'While the tradition of the title "Yahweh Sabaoth, who is enthroned on the cherubim" ... is connected with the ark (I Sam. 4.4; II Sam. 6.2), and this leads some scholars, to derive it and the conception of Yahweh as king from the sanctuary of Shiloh (cf. I Sam. 1.3, 11), it draws so much on the cultic decoration of Solomon's temple with its cherubic throne that here we very probably have a back-projection of the Jerusalem temple theology.... In its present form the ark narrative is doubtless conceived from the end backwards, i.e. from its introduction into the Jerusalem temple. If the ark, which in the meantime had been accepted almost universally, was not itself a divine throne, we must assume, first, that a cherubic throne had already stood in the sanctuary of Shiloh, and secondly, that its static imagination had clung to the ark despite its vagabond fate. However, there is no evidence for the first, and the second is a difficult assumption'. With reference to 1 Sam. 4.4, MT has ארון יהוה צבאות ישב הכרבים, but the OG text is ἐν τῷ κιβωτῷ κυρίου καθημένου χερουβίμ, whereas LXX^{AL} are revised toward the MT. See Driver 1890: 46; Klein 1983: 37; McCarter 1980a: 103; H. P. Smith 1899: 34.

²⁹⁴ Spacing in 4QSam^a precludes the second שם and צבאות (Fincke 2001: 148; Herbert 1997b: 121-123, 154; McKenzie 1984: 48; Ulrich 1978: 66, 160, 194, 197, 201, 204).

Chronicles in 2 Sam. 6.2, 18; 7.27 // 1 Chron. 13.6; 16.2; 17.25); (3) the absolute singular שׁ in MT Samuel and Chronicles which is highly uncharacteristic of biblical Hebrew; (4) the insertion of αὐτοῦ in LXX Chronicles which eases the occurrence of the absolute singular ὄνομα; (5) the insertion of ἐκεῖ in LXX^L Chronicles which suggests the *double reading* שׁ and שׁ; and (6) the repetitious שׁ שׁ in MT Samuel in which the second שׁ serves to *editorially reinterpret* the first שׁ as שׁ rather than שׁ. These points call attention to substantial editing in 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6: שׁ was reinterpreted as שׁ in an earlier שׁ נִקְרָא אֲשֶׁר הָכֵרְבִים עָלָיו, שׁ was interpolated, and צְבָאוֹת was inserted. The versions reflect this editorial process at various stages. Nevertheless, MT Chronicles' consonants are closest to the earlier form of the text.²⁹⁵

3.2 Summary of Chapter Three

The texts and stories of 2 Sam. 6.1-5 and 1 Chron. 13.5-8 differ appreciably. This chapter is concerned with editorial adjustments in the compositions which are signalled by textual variation and grammatical and stylistic incongruities and lexical discrepancies. The major differences between the texts may be classified as pluses/minuses and substitutions. With the exception of the pluses in 1 Chron. 13.5 (מִן־שִׁיחֹר מִצְרִים וְעַד־לְבוֹא) and 6 (אֶל קִרְיַת יַעֲרִים אֲשֶׁר) (חֲמָה) the text of Samuel is regularly fuller. Most differences between Samuel and Chronicles are expansions in Samuel. Consequently, Chronicles' text is generally closer to the (shorter and) earlier form of the story. Twice it is suggested that words in Chronicles were interpolated from Samuel. See מִבֵּית אֲבִינֶדֶב in 3.1.2.3 and יְהוָה יוֹשֵׁב הַכְּרוֹבִים in 3.1.6.2. It is not surprising that biblical editors occasionally adjusted Chronicles on the basis of Samuel since Samuel 'ranked higher in canonical esteem' than

²⁹⁵ See appendix 2.

Chronicles.²⁹⁶ See 2.3.2.1. In several cases it is unclear whether the text of Samuel or Chronicles is closer to the earlier textform and/or it is probable that lexical or stylistic preferences more than polemic determined the forms of the texts. See, e.g., ויעל // ויקם וילך in 3.1.1.3; ובמנענים ובצללים // ובמצלותם ובחצרות in 3.1.4.3; and perhaps אסף // קהל in 3.1.1.2. Three factors influenced the editing of MT Samuel. First, the theme apology of Davidic kingship. See 3.1.1.2, 3.1.2.3, 3.1.3.1, 3.1.3.2, 3.1.3.3, 3.1.3.4, 3.1.4.1. David rather than Saul is rightfully king. This editorial polemic, for example, explains Samuel's terminology in 6.1, which never served as the start of a (now lost) military campaign; rather, the language was adjusted to highlight David's achievements in comparison with Saul's. In particular, several connections between MT 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Samuel 14 were observed. Second, the theme apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character. See 3.1.5.1, 3.1.5.2. The elucidation of Uzzah's identity and the ambiguous record of his location prepare for the misfortune in MT 2 Sam. 6.6-7 which is clearly due to *his* misconduct rather than David's cultic negligence or Yahweh's inexplicable caprice. Third, the theme influence of cultic practice. See 3.1.4.2, 3.1.5.1, 3.1.6.2. Many recognise the influence of religious traditions in the story's moulding. These factors greatly influenced the rest of the story of David's transfer of the ark.

²⁹⁶ Würthwein 1979: 18.

CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis of 2 Samuel 6.6-10 and 1 Chronicles 13.9-13

4.0 Introduction

The exposition in 2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8 supplies information fundamental to the story: the protagonist, the situation, the setting and other background information. Accordingly, the analysis in chapter 3 of the procession's beginning is organised topically: context and occasion, geography, the participants' identity, number and performance, the attendants' identity and position, and the ark's epithets. The procession barely begins, however, when Uzzah is impelled to seize the ark and Yahweh promptly executes him (2 Sam. 6.6-7 // 1 Chron. 13.9-10). This inciting incident initiates the conflict (or complication) which will drive the plot until its climax (or turning point) (2 Sam. 6.17a // 1 Chron. 16.1a): the encounter between Yahweh and Uzzah is ultimately a conflict between the deity and the king. Commentators remark on the problematic character of the material in 2 Sam. 6.6-7 // 1 Chron. 13.9-10: it is marked by textual variation, literary ambiguity, and theological difficulty. *These phenomena are interconnected.* The section following the inciting incident, yet still within the conflict, and prior to the climax, is the rising action. This material alternately conveys David's response to Yahweh's homicidal act (2 Sam. 6.8-10 // 1 Chron. 13.11-13), Yahweh's response to David's rejection (2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14), and David's response to Yahweh's blessing (2 Sam. 6.12b-15 // 1 Chron. 15.25-28). This chapter focuses on 2 Sam. 6.6-10 // 1 Chron. 13.9-13 which relates the inciting incident and the commencement of the rising action.

4.1 Analysis

4.1.1 Uzzah's Error

4.1.1.1 2 Sam. 6.6
 1 Chron. 13.9

// יבאו עד־גֶרֶן נָכוֹן
 יבאו עד־גֶרֶן כִּידֶן

The Israelite threshing-floor was a flat hard circular surface outside on a hill near the edge of a rural or urban locale. The hard surface (of packed soil or smoothed stone or bedrock) prevented earth from mingling with the grain and open air breezes aided winnowing.²⁹⁷ The procession's route and the location of the threshing-floor(s) in 2 Sam. 6.6 // 1 Chron. 13.9 are unknown and will remain so regardless of the manner in which MT's נָכוֹן and כִּידֶן are construed.²⁹⁸ The textual variation among the versions is extensive. The following tables give the evidence and *possible* textual antecedents or *Vorlagen*:

²⁹⁷ Here it is unfeasible and also unnecessary to review historical aspects of the ancient Israelite threshing-floor, such as threshing methodology, the structure of a threshing-floor, temporary versus permanent threshing-floors, community versus privately owned threshing-floors, and the connection of threshing-floors and cult sites. The latter can be confirmed for some ancient societies, but scholars debate the association in biblical literature (e.g., Mnderlein 1978: 64-65), although the relationship between 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 and 2 Samuel 24 // 1 Chronicles 21 is notable.

²⁹⁸ Nevertheless, the comments in Mullins 1992: 904 are suggestive: 'While no name resembling Chidon or Nacon has been preserved, there are two plausible routes for the transport of the ark to Jerusalem. The most direct, but more difficult access would have been to go somewhere along the line of the present Jerusalem–Tel Aviv highway, a distance of about 13 km/8 mi. The easier, but longer way would have been to go from Kiriath-jearim to Gibeon (el-Jib); and then on to Jerusalem via Gibeah of Benjamin (Tell el-Ful). Thus the ark would have been brought through Benjamin in full view of the local population. Given the political tensions between the Benjaminite house of Saul and the Judean house of David, this would have served as a bold statement by David that he is now the one in charge. This latter route also has the benefit of high ground exposed to westerly winds needed for threshing grain. Several threshing floors still exist in the region today'.

Samuel									
Syro-Hexaplar	ܠܝܬܐܪ	ה		נ	ר	ו			א
LXX M ^{mg} , 158/g, 56/i ^{txt} , 245/v, 554/z ^{mg} , 108/b, 82/o, 127/c ₂ = LXX ^L (cf. 19/b', 93/e ₂ , 158/g, 245/v, 246, 707/a	Ορνα τοῦ Ιεβουσαιου	ה		נ	ר	ו			א
LXX 247/x, 376/c	Αχων			ן		ו	כ		א
Barhebraeus' <i>Scholia</i>	ܠܝܬܐܪ				ר	ו	כ		א
LXX M ^{txt} , 55/h*, 56/i ^{mg} , 554/z ^{txt} , <u>rell</u>	Αχωρ				ר	ו	כ		א
LXX N, 55/h ^{cor} , Eusebius <i>Onomasticon</i>	Ναχωρ				ר	ו	כ	נ	
LXX B	Νωδαβ		ב		ד	ו		נ	
LXX 509/a ₂	Νοδαβ		ב		ד	ו		נ	
4QSam ^a	נורן ²⁹⁹			ן	ר	ו		נ	
MT	נכון			ן		ו	כ	נ	
Mishnah <i>Baba Bathra</i> 2.8	קבוע			ן		ו	כ	נ	
Targum	מחקן			ן		ו	כ	נ	
Peshitta	ܠܝܬܐܪ			ן		ו	כ	נ	
LXX A	Ναχων			ן		ו	כ	נ	
Aquila	ἐτοίμης			ן		ו	כ	נ	
Vulgate	<i>Nachon</i>			ן		ו	כ	נ	
Josephus' <i>Antiquities</i> 7.4.2 (cf. <i>Chronicles</i>)	Χειδωνος			ן	ד	י	כ		

Chronicles									
MT	כידן			ן	ד	י	כ		
LXX 106/p, 107/d, 120/q, 134/t, 243/j, 489/f, 554/z	χιδων			ן	ד	י	כ		
OL	<i>sceptri</i>			ן	ד	י	כ		
Vulgate	<i>Chidon</i>			ן	ד	י	כ		
LXX A, N	Χειλων			ן	ל	י	כ		
LXX 19/b', 108/b	Χαιλων			ן	ל	י	כ		
LXX 92/m, 93/e ₂ , 158/g	Χελων			ן	ל	י	כ		
LXX B <u>rell</u> ; Origen's 5th column ³⁰⁰	minus								

Preliminary remarks: (1) Most are uncertain about the earliest/original reading(s). (2) Most believe *Chronicles*' reading does not entail a tendentious alteration of the book's *Vorlage*. (3) Most text-critical discussions are incomplete: they fail to consider the entirety of the evidence and they neglect literary facets of the textual traditions. (4) The witnesses cited above may be placed into about five groups, broadly defined, and *within* each group, except for the one reflecting נכון, additional textual variation is evident. (5)

²⁹⁹ Fincke 2001: 149 reads כידן erroneously. *BHS*, McCarter 1984: 164, and Ulrich 1978: 195 read נורן. Herbert 1997b: 124 says 'The third letter, however, is a regular ר, lacking the ד's characteristic sharp right shoulder. 4QSam^a, therefore, deviates from all witnesses'.

³⁰⁰ Field 1875: I, 715.

The letter כ (followed by י/ו) is most consistent throughout the witnesses. (6) OG Samuel may be Νωδαβ and OG Chronicles is certainly a minus. Is the latter due to haplography through homoioteleuton (גֵּרֶן כִּידֶן) or is the simple reading גֵּרֶן/דִּהֶרֶן ἄλωνος the starting point for the compositional processes in the versions? (7) In anticipation of the conclusion reached below, the readings in MT Samuel and MT Chronicles are genetically unrelated but perhaps conceptually similar. Each reading may be an independent expansion of an original דִּהֶרֶן. Otherwise, if one of the MT traditions is secondary to the other, then MT Samuel's נָכוֹן is probably secondary to MT Chronicles' כִּידֶן. The bases for this assertion are (a) greater variation among witnesses to Samuel and (b) discernible literary motives for the readings נָכוֹן (and אֲוֶרְנָה) in Samuel.

The words נָכוֹן and כִּידֶן are construed as proper names, common nouns, or in the case of נָכוֹן, as an adjective. The greater part of medieval and modern commentators, most ancient versions (see below for other renderings), and almost all modern English translations, construe the second element in the phrases גֵּרֶן נָכוֹן and גֵּרֶן כִּידֶן as proper nouns: 'the threshing-floor of Nacon' or 'Nacon's threshing-floor' (except for NAB's 'Nodan' which is based on 4QSam^a) and 'the threshing-floor of Chidon' or 'Chidon's threshing-floor' (except for the NJB which has 'the threshing-floor of the Javelin'). Some emend Samuel on the basis of Chronicles³⁰¹ or Chronicles on the basis of Samuel³⁰², but the variants do not have an obvious genetic relationship. No view has garnered broad support because none convincingly relates the two major families of variants, those beginning with נ/ν and those beginning with כ/χ. The *potential* orthographical and phonological errors are self-evident in the table above. A thorough analysis of the readings with possible derivations and revisions requires an entire chapter. Two points require mention. First, it is specious to conclude that Josephus was dependent on

³⁰¹ Rehm 1949b: 81.

³⁰² Braun 1986: 172-175.

Chronicles for Χειδωνος.³⁰³ Second, most reject the textual originality of the Samuel variants having the Araunah/Ornan of 2 Samuel 24 // 1 Chronicles 21. Many ancient and medieval commentators favoured this reading in 2 Sam. 6.6 // 1 Chron. 13.9, but thematic links between the two narratives and the unlikelihood that an Araunah/Ornan in the preceding story would be altered are arguments against the reading's originality. In spite of its popularity, the view that גרן and נכון are proper nouns in MT Samuel and Chronicles must be rejected. First, the notion of private ownership of a threshing-floor is questionable. The only other possible examples are doubtful³⁰⁴: גרן האמד in Gen. 50.10-11 cannot be a personal name and the *common noun* in גרן האורנה/ארניה // גרן ארנן in 2 Sam. 24.16, 18 // 1 Chron. 21.15, 18, 28; 2 Chron. 3.1 has a Hittite provenance, thus Seow says: 'If האמד and (ה)אורנה are not personal names, "the threshing floor of PN" in 2 Sam 6:6 would be unique in the Bible. Indeed, as a PN נכון is without parallel in Semitic onomastica'.³⁰⁵ Second, 'Neither the author nor his readers would be familiar with the name of the owner of every threshing-floor between Kirjath-jearim and Jerusalem'.³⁰⁶

Some construe the second element in the phrases גרן נכון and גרן כידן as common nouns. In addition, OL Chronicles has *sceptri*. Keil and Delitzsch relate Chronicles' כידן to the noun כיד, a *hapax legomenon* used in Job 21.20, and translate 'the threshing-floor of destruction/disaster'.³⁰⁷ Youngblood suggests that Chronicles' כידן is a defectively written form of כידון ('dart, javelin, spear'), which is used nine times³⁰⁸ and is also written defectively in Jer. 50.42.³⁰⁹ This is the natural understanding of כידן in MT 1 Chron. 13.9 and only bias in favour of Samuel can reasonably lead one to abandon it. גרן כידן is 'a

³⁰³ Ulrich 1978: 213, 254.

³⁰⁴ The ownership of the threshing-floor in Ruth is unstated.

³⁰⁵ Seow 1989: 97-98 n. 52.

³⁰⁶ W. R. Arnold 1917: 62.

³⁰⁷ Keil and Delitzsch 1866: 332 (emphasis added).

³⁰⁸ Josh. 8.18, 26; 1 Sam. 17.6, 45; Jer. 6.23; 50.42; Job 39.23; 41.21

³⁰⁹ Youngblood 1992: 871.

threshing-floor of a spear' or 'a "piercing"-threshing-floor'. Similarly, some scholars entertain the common noun view for Samuel's נכון which they relate to the verb נכה³¹⁰ and translate as 'the threshing-floor of the blow/stroke' (cf. Job 12.5).³¹¹ Literary factors in support of this view are mentioned below. The interpretation of נכון and כידן as common nouns is more defensible than their interpretation as proper names. Furthermore, נכון and כידן would also be similar in concept.

A few interpret Samuel's נכון as a N participle of כון, thus as an adjective. Several ancient witnesses also support this interpretation: the Targum's מוחקן, the Peshitta's ܡܚܩܢ, Aquila's ἐτοίμησ, and cognate קבוע in Mishnah *Baba Bathra* 2.8 and the Gemara thereon. The meaning of נכון גרן may be construed as 'a certain threshing-floor', or 'a prepared threshing-floor' (i.e., smoothed and swept), or more likely 'a fixed/permanent threshing-floor': 'The reader, upon being informed that the oxen had come to a "permanent threshing floor" would immediately picture a floor either of rock or of very hard earth, on which a slip such as that of Uzzah was quite natural'.³¹² Scholars raise four objections to this interpretation³¹³: (1) Aquila often renders proper names adjectivally. (2) קבוע may not be the exact equivalent of נכון.³¹⁴ (3) The noun גרן is given as feminine by lexicographers, but the evidence is sparse and the gender seems to have varied.³¹⁵ (4) Some say the phrase so construed would be pointless, 'But we have seen that the sense *is* satisfied if the description can be shown to have direct bearing on the accident'.³¹⁶

³¹⁰ The derivation of נכון from נכה is similar to other nouns derived from ל"ה verbs, such as חזון from חזה, חרון from חרה, and חרון from חרה. The typical noun for a 'blow' is מכה (cf. 1 Sam. 6.19).

³¹¹ Keil and Delitzsch 1866: 332; Tur-Sinai 1951: 279. Also see *HALOT* II, 698. Emphasis added.

³¹² Marget 1920: 75.

³¹³ See Carlson 1964: 77-78.

³¹⁴ However, see Jastrow 1903: 1311.

³¹⁵ Interestingly, רוח is usually but not always construed as feminine (*HALOT* III, 1197-1198), and also when modified by an adjective (e.g., רוח גדולה, רוח חדשה, רוח טובה, רוח רעה), but Ps. 51.12 has רוח נכון, and this is the only other attributive adjective use of נכון.

³¹⁶ Marget 1920: 72.

The minus in OG Chronicles *may* reflect the earliest form of the text: 'and they came to *the threshing-floor*'. The article is either the simple identification or well-known ('celebrity', 'familiar') usage³¹⁷. The expressions גֶרֶן נֶכֶן and גֶרֶן כִידֶן are anarthrous, and since the *nomen rectum* in each case is doubtfully a proper name, the phrases must be translated indefinitely:

Samuel	'a fixed/permanent threshing-floor'
	'a threshing-floor of a blow/stroke'
	'a "striking"-threshing-floor'
Chronicles	'a threshing-floor of a spear'
	'a "piercing"-threshing-floor'

The comment creates tension in the narrative and foreshadows the incident to follow, e.g.,: 'and they came to a "killer"-threshing-floor [oh no!] and Uzzah reached out ... and Yahweh's anger was kindled against Uzzah and God struck [נכה] him there ...'. Is the phrase solely metaphorical or does the story hint at the manner in which the ark's military escort dispatched Uzzah? Moreover, does Chronicles have the word כִידֶן(ו)ן for this reason? Furthermore, word-linkage in 2 Sam. 6.6-7 suggests that נֶכֶן and נֶכָה play on one another. The verb נֶכָה also recalls 'the wave of plague and death' of 1 Samuel 5–6³¹⁸, and continues too a theme that is played out in Saul's and David's military escapades in between the two stories, most recently in 2 Sam. 5.8, 20, 24-25.

4.1.1.2	2 Sam. 6.6	וַיִּשְׁלַח עֹזָא אֶל־אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאחֲזוּ בּוֹ //
	1 Chron. 13.9	וַיִּשְׁלַח עֹזָא אֶת־יָדוֹ לֶאֱחָז אֶת־הָאֲרוֹן

The absence of 'his hand' in MT Samuel could be the result of ellipsis but the collective evidence suggests that the phrase originally stood here, as most commentators conclude. First, the phrase appears in the preponderance of ancient witnesses, including 4QSam^a, LXX Samuel, Josephus, and Chronicles. Second, 'hand' is absent in prose from

³¹⁷ See, e.g., Judg. 6.37; 2 Kgs. 6.27; Ruth 3.2-3, 6, 14.
³¹⁸ McCarter 1984: 169; cf. 1 Sam. 5.6, 9, 12; 6.19 (also with מִכָּה).

an implicit *שלח* construction only in 2 Sam. 6.6, although the ellipsis of other objects following *שלח*, especially 'word/letter/message', is not uncommon. Third, Chronicles' construction with the complementary infinitive is frequent but an investigation of the formal structures in which *שלח* is used points out the awkwardness of the object following *אל* in MT Samuel and 4QSam^a, which is generally a person ('send a message to a person') and less commonly a place ('send a messenger to a place'), but a non-geographic place in Samuel only in 1 Sam. 17.49 and 2 Sam. 6.6. This stylistic incongruity together with *ἐπί* in LXX Samuel (LXX^L is revised to *πρός*) may indicate that MT Samuel's *אל* is unoriginal.³¹⁹ The phrase *את ידו* perhaps dropped from MT Samuel by haplography through homoioarcton (*וּשְׁלַח עוֹזָא [אֶת יָדוֹ] אֶל אֲרֹן*), in which case the omission is subsequent to the adjustment of an original *אל* to *על*. Then again, Murray argues that the minus is original and should not be restored

for good rhetorical reasons ... The addition of *את ידו* before *אל ארון האלהים* considerably weakens the impact of the latter, whereas the ellipsis heightens its impact by placing it in the position where *את ידו* would be expected, and thus demanding increased processing effort from the listener/reader.³²⁰

This argument, however, may explain the intentional omission of the phrase, and the collective evidence mentioned above should not be dismissed either. Finally, the evidence of usage is inconclusive regarding the ethical force of *שלח* [יד] in 2 Sam. 6.6 and 1 Chron. 13.9, 10, and must be construed by context and the force of the complementary verb phrase. The phrases *שלח יד אל/על* are used to express both hostile and non-hostile *שלח*-ing, and hostility would be expressed more pointedly by means of *שלח יד ב*.

Many think Chronicles' infinitival form (*לִאֲחֹזֵהוּ*) is a tendentious alteration of Samuel's *wayyiqtol* (*וַיֵּאָחֵז בּוֹ*): 'The Chronicler from a feeling of reverence shrinks from

³¹⁹ See appendix 3.

³²⁰ Murray 1998: 58-59.

saying, *and took hold of it* (2 Sam. vi. 6).³²¹ For the Chronicler, 'even the intention' to touch the ark was sufficient to incur God's wrath.³²² The versions are key to resolving the editorial history of the text. 4QSam^a's reading is unclear. Fincke reconstructs the text as וְיָחַז (!) ³²³ and Herbert as וְיָחַז ³²⁴, but McKenzie and Ulrich favour וְיָחַז .³²⁵ The Greek witnesses to Samuel reflect either Chronicles' infinitival form or both the infinitival form and the finite verb form, but *no Greek witness to Samuel attests only MT Samuel's* finite verb form. On one hand, LXX^{MN} and four cursives have $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$, lacking $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$ altogether, and similarly Josephus has $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \epsilon\theta\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$. On the other hand, most cursives and the Lucianic recension have a doublet ($\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu/\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$) and LXX^{AB} and three cursives have a triplet ($\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \dots\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu/\sigma\chi\iota\acute{\zeta}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$).³²⁶ The correspondence between Chronicles' $\text{וְיָחַז}/\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ and Greek Samuel's $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ validates the view that Chronicles' infinitive is not editorial, as many commentators recognise.³²⁷

Few seem to ponder whether MT Samuel's וְיָחַז could be a tendentious modification to the story, but this may be the case. The G stem of וְיָחַז ('take possession of, lay/take hold of, hold fast, seize, grasp') generally implies 'a certain vivacity or forcefulness'³²⁸, and this is due to the punctual *Aktionsart* of the verb which portrays a

³²¹ Elmslie 1916: 97.

³²² Ackroyd 1973: 57.

³²³ Fincke 2001: 150.

³²⁴ Herbert 1997b: 121, 124.

³²⁵ McKenzie 1984: 78; Ulrich 1978: 200.

³²⁶ OG Samuel is $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\ \tau\eta\nu\ \kappa\iota\beta\omega\tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$ and OG Chronicles is $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \kappa\iota\beta\omega\tau\omicron\nu$. Subsequently, Greek Samuel was revised toward MT Samuel by the insertion of the finite verb phrase $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu/\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$. Contrary to general practice, however, the reviser of the OG placed the approximation to MT *after* the OG reading in order to avoid the awkward pattern $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\epsilon\nu\ \dots\ \tau\eta\nu\ \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\ \dots\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \dots$ (Ulrich 1978: 199-201; cf. Klein 1974: 48-49; Nysse 1984: 201-203, 380, 472).

³²⁷ Contra Rehm 1937: 26-27, Greek Samuel's infinitival form was not derived from Chronicles.

³²⁸ Konkel 1997: 354.

swift and immediate change.³²⁹ The object of the G stem of אָחַז is expressed by כּ (20 times), a pronominal suffix (12 times), an accusative (ten times), and אֶת (five times), and each of these is used for hostile or violent grasping. Consequently, the statement that אָחַז with כּ is used 'sometimes perh. intensifying action of verb'³³⁰ is true insofar as the context of the situation somehow specifies a more intensive than usual act of grasping. Furthermore, a perfective form (in this case *wayyiqtol*) of a verb with punctual *Aktionsart* relates an instantaneous or momentary occurrence but it does not and cannot accentuate the act of grasping. A suitable contrast, however, between Samuel's וַיֹּאחֲזֵה בּוֹ and Chronicles' לֵאחֹזֵה אֶת־הָאָרֶן, may be the grammatical completed-ness of the former and incompleteness of the latter. Of course, 1 Chron. 13.10 explicitly says Uzzah placed his hand on the ark, but 1 Chron. 13.9 does not go this far. Consequently, Samuel's *wayyiqtol* vis-à-vis Chronicles' infinitive may stress that Uzzah *definitely* handled the ark, and this in turn may serve to rationalise Yahweh's behaviour in 2 Sam. 6.7. See below.³³¹

4.1.1.3 2 Sam. 6.6 כִּי שִׁמְשׁוּ הַבָּקָר
 1 Chron. 13.9

The Hebrew and Greek versions³³² effectively agree on כִּי שִׁמְשׁוּ הַבָּקָר but the significance of the clause is paradoxically mysterious. The verb שִׁמַּשׁ occurs nine times, seven times in the G stem and once each in the N and H stems. The G form is presumably transitive and is generally glossed 'release, relinquish, remit, loosen, let drop, let loose, let rest'.³³³ However, assuming הַבָּקָר is the subject, the Hebrew clause lacks the requisite object. Consequently, many commentators and some modern translators supply 'it'.

³²⁹ See the note on *Aktionsart* (and tense and aspect) in the discussion of 2 Sam. 6.1 // 1 Chron. 13.5 in section 1.4.5 of appendix 1.

³³⁰ DCH I, 186.

³³¹ On the ark's epithet see appendix 2.

³³² It is unnecessary to discuss here the interesting conjectures in the Syriac and Latin texts regarding the meaning of the clause.

³³³ See Exod. 23.11; Deut. 15.2; 2 Kgs 9.33; Jer. 17.4.

However, many others, including most modern translators, render the clause intransitively: 'the oxen stumbled'. Others wish to construe the subject and object of the verb in unique ways. For example: Uzzah and Ahio are the subject and the oxen are the object, i.e., 'they dropped the leads'; but this is unlikely since the object marker **אֶת** is lacking. MT's **שָׁמְטוּ** is pointed as a G perfect 3cp form. Some re-point as **שָׁמְטוּ**, a G perfect 3ms form with a 3ms suffix (cf. καὶ ἐκράτησεν/ἐκραταίωσεν αὐτήν) or perhaps a dual form with a 3ms suffix (*šamāṭāhū).³³⁴ The collective noun **בָּקָר** is employed for a team of oxen, and therefore the noun should be construed with a plural verb³³⁵, which makes **שָׁמְטוּ** rather unlikely. However, the evidence is sparse. Finally, W. R. Arnold adopts Bochart's view based on Arabic analogy that the oxen defecated: Uzzah slipped because the oxen shot!³³⁶ Whatever the solution, MT Samuel and Chronicles agree, and the textual traditions are more concerned with pinning the blame on Uzzah than in resolving the exact role of the oxen. They may have caused it but he did IT!

4.1.2 Yahweh's Response

4.1.2.1 2 Sam. 6.7
1 Chron. 13.10

וַיַּחֲרֶאֱף יְהוָה בַּעֲזוֹהָ

The Hebrew versions of Samuel and Chronicles are identical except for the spelling of Uzzah's name: 'the anger of Yahweh burned/was kindled/was aroused against Uzzah' or 'Yahweh was angry/was incensed with/at Uzzah'. The Greek traditions vary in two matters. First, was **אָף** present in the Hebrew texts used by the translators? Allen and Nysse have shown that both followed a *Vorlage* lacking **אָף**.³³⁷ As additional evidence, the G stem of **חָרַף** is used 82 times in the following constructions:

³³⁴ McCarter 1984: 164.

³³⁵ GKC §145b, p. 462.

³³⁶ W. R. Arnold 1917: 63.

³³⁷ Allen 1974: I, 145; Nysse 1984: 346.

(1)	X ב Y אף	חרה	38 times	'anger of Y burns against X'
(2)	Y ל	חרה	24 times	'burns to Y'
			+ 1 infinitive construct	(object <i>only</i> implied)
(3)	Y אף	חרה	14 times	'anger of Y burns'
				(object <i>only</i> implied)
(4)	X ב Y	חרה	once	'Y burns against X'
(5)	X על Y אף	חרה	once	'anger of Y burns against X'
(6)	X אל Y אף	חרה	once	'anger of Y burns against X'
(7)		חרה בעינים	twice	'burns in the eyes of Y'

The fourth construction appears only in the poetry of Hab. 3.8. The first represents nearly half of all occurrences of חרה. An earlier X ב Y חרה in Samuel and Chronicles was (independently?—or was Chronicles revised on the basis of Samuel?) assimilated to the more common construction. Second, do τῷ Oζα in some manuscripts of Samuel and ἐπὶ Oζα in Chronicles attest *Vorlagen* distinct to א/ב? In Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint the verb θυμώ appears with no personal dative and no preposition (27 times), or it is construed with ἐπὶ (14 times; with an accusative or dative), a personal dative (eight times), εἰς (four times), ἐν (four times), περί (three times), πρός (twice), and κατά (once). Omitting further details, except to say that the Greek translators (of Samuel and Chronicles too) are inconsistent in rendering the preposition in the phrase חרה (אף) ב, Nysse concludes correctly regarding Samuel that 'the use of a preposition is only a potential revision toward the MT, for it could also be a stylistic alteration on the part of G:B+ [=MSS Bya₂] or G:L'.³³⁸ The same may be said for Chronicles. It will be shown below that Yahweh's anger expressed by X ב Y אף חרה (2 Sam. 6.7 // 1 Chron. 13.10) and David's anger expressed by Y ל חרה (2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11) are *not* qualitatively different; rather, the latter is a *stylistic* circumlocution for the maintenance of reverence.³³⁹

³³⁸ Nysse 1984: 346.

³³⁹ Yahweh's anger is rarely directed against a specific person, and never with the dire outcome handed out to Uzzah: Moses (Exod. 4.14), Miriam and Aaron (Num. 12.9), Balaam (Num. 22.22), Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar (Job 42.7), Amaziah (2 Chron. 25.15), and potential anger against Abraham (Gen. 18.30, 32) and Gideon (Judg. 6.39).

The verbs ἔπαυσεν and ἐπάταξεν are intra-Greek variations based on idiomatic considerations rather than alternate *Vorlagen*.³⁴⁰ The adverb שם occurs 834 times, including 90 times in Samuel, 101 times in Kings, and 40 times in Chronicles. שם appears 31 times in synoptic passages: it is shared 17 times and it is a plus eleven times in Samuel–Kings and three times in Chronicles. However in ten of the latter fourteen cases the plus is part of a more significant difference or expansion of which שם is merely one element. Thus, Samuel has a plus in the present passage, Kings has a plus in 1 Kgs. 8.9 // 2 Chron. 5.10, and Chronicles has pluses in 2 Sam. 5.6 // 1 Chron. 11.4 and 2 Kgs. 19.37 // 2 Chron. 32.21. Furthermore, the adverb שם marks the location of an act of נכה on six occasions, in 2 Sam. 5.20 // 1 Chron. 14.11, and in 2 Sam. 3.27; 6.7; 10.18; 18.11, and in each case שם is superfluous to a reference to a particular location. The absence of שם in MT Chronicles may relate to an editor's attempt to avoid repetition (cf. וימת שם), but it may also reflect an idiomatic addition in Samuel. Regarding LXX Chronicles, Allen and Rehm believe ἐκεῖ is an example of assimilation to the parallel (Greek) text.³⁴¹ Some consider Chronicles' shorter text the original³⁴² whereas others consider only האלהים a pleonasm.³⁴³ W. R. Arnold and Youngblood consider שם האלהים original. Youngblood believes שם emphasises the threshing floor as the locale of Uzzah's death: God struck him *there* and he died *there*.³⁴⁴ W. R. Arnold believes the superfluous reference to the deity is 'thoroughly characteristic of the author's style'.³⁴⁵ There is no plausible reason for the

³⁴⁰ Nysse 1984: 228.

³⁴¹ Allen 1974: I, 191; Rehm 1937: 44.

³⁴² Budde 1890: 229; Dhorme 1910: 321; McCarter 1984: 164-164; McKenzie 1984: 49.

³⁴³ Nowack 1902: 173; H. P. Smith 1899: 292, 294.

³⁴⁴ Youngblood 1992: 871.

³⁴⁵ W. R. Arnold : 64.

omission of האלהים from Chronicles, but Fokkelman explains the significance of 'God' and involuntarily supplies a reasonable explanation for the insertion in Samuel:

Except in v. 7b, the word 'God' serves only as a modification of the ark in the set phrase 'the ark of God', and occurs only in vv.2-7 and 12, seven times to boot. From v.9 onwards the set phrase is relieved of duty by 'the ark of Yahweh', which remarkably enough occurs the same number of times. ... The priest who wants to support 'the ark of God' and must die right next to it is killed by God, after Yahweh has become angry – a remarkable variation. Line 7b is the only place where 'God' is more than a modifier; He is now the subject who acts. It seems as if this passage wants to link the general term 'God' to Uzzah (just as the previous one withholds the specific *yhwh* from his brother in 4b) so as to suggest that this priest no longer had any insight into the uniqueness of the God of Israel. Then 6b and 7bc repeat the focalisation of Uzzah, whilst the narrator in 7a actually does have an eye for what is specific about this God and designates him by his own name, as does David immediately afterwards in vv. 8-9. The victory of the name of Yahweh has become a fact after this blow.³⁴⁶

Fokkelman's comment that 'this passage wants to link the general term "God" to Uzzah ... so as to suggest that this priest no longer had any insight into the uniqueness of the God of Israel' is striking. Samuel's version of Uzzah's slaughter is revisionary, the product of enhanced theological acumen. Again, Uzzah rather than David or Yahweh is held responsible for his own death.

The explanation for Yahweh's execution of Uzzah is textually and theologically fascinating. According to 2 Sam. 6.7 the reason is על-השל but according to 1 Chron. 13.10 it is על אשר-שלח ידו על-הארון. What is the earliest reading and what is the basis for Yahweh's outburst? The textual evidence is:

³⁴⁶ Fokkelman 1990: 180, 188.

Samuel		
MT	על־השל	'for/because of (his) crime / error / fault / inadvertence / inadvertent act / indiscretion / irreverence / irreverent act / neglect / negligence / rashness / remissness'
Targum	על דאשהלי	'because he erred/failed himself'
LXX A (om τῆ), 19/b', 52/e, 56/i, 82/o, 92/m, 93/e ₂ , 108/b, 127/c ₂ (sub ※), 158/g, 243/j ^{mg} (sub ※), 247/x, 314/w, 376/c, 489/f	ἐπὶ τῇ προπετείᾳ	'on account of rashness' This reading is the Lucianic recension, is marked in Origen's Hexapla as an addition, and is also reflected in the Armenian version, Barhebraeus' <i>Scholia</i> and in the Syro-Hexaplar.
Aquila	ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκνοίᾳ	'on account of senselessness' ³⁴⁷
Jerome's Vulgate	<i>super temeritate</i>	'in the matter of recklessness' ³⁴⁸
Jerome's <i>Dialogi contra Pelagianos</i>	<i>pro ignorantia</i>	'(as punishment) for ignorance' This is cited as the OL by Sabatier, but whether this is really the OL reading is disputed. ³⁴⁹
4QSam ^a	Herbert ³⁵⁰ : על אשר שלח ידו אל הארון Fincke ³⁵¹ : (על השל) כיא שלח ידו אל הארון	'because he reached out his hand toward/against the ark' ³⁵²
Peshitta	בִּלְדָּא מִשְׁתַּחֲמֵד	'because he stretched out his hand'
LXX B, M, N, 29/b ₂ , 55/h, 106/p, 107/d, 119/n, 120/q, 121/y, 130/s, 134/t, 243/j ^{txt} , 245/v, 370/l, 372/u, 509/a ₂ , 554/z, 707/a	minus	The minus is also reflected in the Coptic and Ethiopic versions.

³⁴⁷ Dhorme 1910: 321.

³⁴⁸ Bressan 1960: 525.

³⁴⁹ For discussion see Nysse 1984: 30-31; Ulrich 1978: 219.

³⁵⁰ Herbert 1997b: 124-125.

³⁵¹ Fincke 2001: 150.

³⁵² Also see Pisano 1984: 104-106; Ulrich 1978: 159, 179, 195, 205-206, 233.

Chronicles		
MT	עַל אֲשֶׁר-שָׁלַח יָדוֹ עַל-הָאָרוֹן	'because he put forth / reached out his hand to / toward / on / upon / against the ark'
Peshitta	ⲕⲁⲓⲁⲃⲁⲥ ⲛⲁ ⲙⲉⲗⲁ ⲕⲁⲙ ⲛⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲥ ⲛⲁ	'because he stretched out his hand upon/against the ark'
LXX (all manuscripts except 107/d)	διὰ τὸ ἐκτείνειν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν κιβωτόν	'because he stretched out his hand upon/against the ark'
Jerome's Vulgate	<i>quod contigisset arcam</i>	'because he touched the ark'
LXX 107/d	minus	

Josephus' *Antiquities* 7.4.2 has ἐκτείναντα τὴν χεῖρα καὶ κατασχεῖν ἐθελήσαντα, ὅτι μὴ ὦν ἱερεὺς ἤψατο ταύτης, but it is unclear from where he derived the longer plus or whether it is his logical deduction. The minus in LXX^{BMN} and numerous other cursives of Samuel cannot convincingly be explained away as omission out of desperation over a supposedly incomprehensible Hebrew *Vorlage*. Rather, this is the OG reading. 'The OG apparently lacked the plus, going back to an early, characteristically concise, Egyptian Hebrew text'.³⁵³

The G:L reading is a marked, hexaplaric addition. This is the only one of the three such readings in this section in which MSS Acx corroborate G:L. The OG *Vorlage* lacked this plus. The Pal tradition has expanded the text independently. Three text types are in evidence.³⁵⁴

There are effectively four possibilities for the genesis of the textual variation.

- MT Samuel's shorter text is original and Chronicles' and 4QSam^a's longer text is a clarification.
- Chronicles' and 4QSam^a's longer text is original and MT Samuel's shorter text is either a mutilation or a purposeful alteration.
- Both the shorter and longer texts are 'original': each represents an alternative *Vorlage* or tradition.
- Neither the shorter nor the longer text is original: each is an independent expansion.

³⁵³ Ulrich 1978: 205.
³⁵⁴ Nysse 1984: 366; cf. 462.

The extant traditions could be based on (1) textual sources, (2) oral information, (3) free composition or (4) logical deduction. Excepting the (N)RSV, which emends Samuel on the basis of 4QSam^a and Chronicles, modern English translations retain the shorter reading in Samuel and the longer reading in Chronicles.

Most commentators (but not translators) think Samuel's shorter text is corrupt, a mutilated fragment of a reading like Chronicles', and Samuel is restored accordingly.

Driver gives the classic statement:

Ch. has על אשר שלח ידו על הארון וימת שם; and when the strangeness of the Hebrew expression here used is considered, it will hardly be deemed too venturesome to regard it as a mutilated fragment of the words cited from Ch., which were either still read here in their integrity by the Chronicler, or (as the sense is sufficiently plain without them) were introduced here as a gloss from the parallel text of Ch., and afterwards became corrupted.³⁵⁵

However, it is impossible that the shorter reading is solely the result of parablepsis, since the difference between the two MT versions is more than simple subtraction:

Chronicles	ויכחו שם האלהים על אשר שלח ידו על הארון וימת שם
Samuel	ויכחו שם האלהים על השל וימת שם

The two versions clearly show editorial adjustments in Samuel's שם האלהים and Chronicles' ידו על-הארון, and one must also account for the additional ה in MT Samuel. Even if the shorter reading is the result of scribal error, it must also be an editorially restored version, and presumably one in which the intentionally inserted ה was meaningful. The 'corruption' must have been substantial for על-השל to remain!

Some think Samuel's shorter text is the remnant of another non-extant reading, and should be restored through conjectural emendation. W. R. Arnold, followed by Marget, thinks the text originally had וישל (from נשל, 'slip').³⁵⁶ An original על phrase in this context could just as easily refer to (1) the manner in which Uzzah died, i.e., by means of X, or to (2) a location, i.e., Uzzah was killed on/upon/in front of a given place or object.

³⁵⁵ Driver 1890: 268.
³⁵⁶ W. R. Arnold 1917: 63; Marget 1920: 72.

Thus several suggest that the residue most likely represents an attempt to give a location which is now unintelligible. H. P. Smith takes this view but does not venture to suggest a particular locale.³⁵⁷ Klostermann likes על־השלב, 'on the side beam' of the cart on which Uzzah sat.³⁵⁸ Dhorme likes על־האשל, 'near the tamarisk tree' (cf. 1 Sam. 22.6; 31.13).³⁵⁹

Several medieval Jewish scholars, some modern scholars³⁶⁰, and most modern English translators, think Samuel's shorter reading is understandable and should be retained as original. In this view the preposition על is causal³⁶¹, and של's translation should be 'crime, error, fault, inadvertence, inadvertent act, indiscretion, irreverence, irreverent act, neglect, negligence, rashness, remissness'. This perspective is based on cognate vocabulary.³⁶² Akkadian evidence is the verbs *šelû* ('be negligent, careless, inattentive') and *šullû/sullû* ('treat disdainfully') and the nouns *šilûtu* ('negligence'), *šillatu* ('blasphemy, sacrilege, insult, insolence, slander, offence, misdeed') and *šullû/sullû* ('impudence, disloyal speech'). Aramaic evidence is the noun של/שלי ('error') and the verb שלה/שלא/שלי ('err'). The noun שלו occurs in Dan. 3.29; 6.5; Ezra 4.22; 6.9; and both the noun and the verb are frequent in post-biblical Aramaic. The related adverbial expression ܫܠܐܢܐܢܐ ('suddenly') can also be mentioned. In addition, the Hebrew cognate verb שלה occurs eight times.³⁶³ Notice that the noun and verb are used for cultic 'negligence' in Dan. 3.29; Ezra 6.9; 2 Chron. 29.11. Thus של is the Hebrew cognate to Aramaic שלו. Apocope is frequent in the nominal and verbal forms of ל"ה roots³⁶⁴, but it has been suggested that של could be the exact equivalent of שלו if the *waw* on the following word

³⁵⁷ H. P. Smith 1899: 294.

³⁵⁸ Klostermann 1887: 152.

³⁵⁹ Dhorme 1910: 321.

³⁶⁰ Barthélemy 1982: 243-244; Carlson 1964: 79; Fokkelman 1990: 378; Keil and Delitzsch 1866: 332-333; Pisano 1984: 104-106; Youngblood 1992: 879.

³⁶¹ BDB 753-754; HALOT II, 826; GKC §158, p. 492; JM §170h, p. 639.

³⁶² CAD XV, 366; XVII, part II, 274-275, 445-447, 453; HALOT IV, 1502-1504; V, 1994.

³⁶³ 2 Kgs. 4.28; Jer. 12.1; Ps. 122.6; Job 3.26; 12.6; 27.8; Lam. 1.5; 2 Chron. 29.11

³⁶⁴ JM §17f, p. 75.

(וימת) 'were doing double duty'³⁶⁵ or if the final *waw* disappeared via haplography.³⁶⁶ In spite of this lexical and grammatical evidence most scholars still believe של in 2 Sam. 6.7 is 'dubious, corrupt, meaningless, unintelligible, untranslatable', and very often a reference is made to Driver: '(1) של is scarcely a pure Hebrew word: where it occurs, it is either dialectical (2 Ki. 4) or late (2 Ch.); so that its appearance in early Hebrew is unexpected; (2) the unusual apocopated form (של for שלי) excites suspicion'.³⁶⁷ However, Driver's presupposition is that Samuel is an 'early' biblical composition, and even if his historical linguistic argument were correct, it would not cancel out the view that של is a late editorial revision in 2 Sam. 6.7.³⁶⁸ The exact derivation of של is uncertain, but it is certainly 'meaningful, intelligible, translatable' in 2 Sam. 6.7, as evinced in the translations and commentaries of quite a few ancient, medieval and modern scholars.

Scholars who argue for the integrity of MT Samuel's reading suggest that perplexity over של's meaning led to (1) its erasure in the OG translation and to (2) the explanation in the tradition represented by 4QSam^a and Chronicles. However, these assumptions are baseless. The view taken here is that both pluses, על אשר-שלח and על-השל, ידו על-הארון, are independent expansions of the original story which failed to supply an explanation for Yahweh's behaviour. On one hand, 1 Chron. 13.10 actualises through logical deduction the intention of 1 Chron. 13.9 (see above): 'Uzzah extended his hand to grasp the ark (incompleted-ness) and Yahweh struck him dead *because he extended his hand upon/against the ark* (completed-ness)'. Barthélemy is correct in concluding that 'le texte le plus coulant provienne d'un développement inspiré par le contenu du verset précédent'.³⁶⁹ On the other hand, 2 Sam. 6.7 concretises Uzzah's grasping and also

³⁶⁵ Watson 1969: 531; Youngblood 1992: 879.

³⁶⁶ Fokkelman 1990: 378.

³⁶⁷ Driver 1890: 267-268.

³⁶⁸ See appendix 3.

³⁶⁹ Barthélemy 1982: 243.

emphasises the nature of Uzzah's act: 'Uzzah extended his hand upon/against the ark of God and he grasped it (completed-ness) and God struck him dead there *because of his negligence*'. Chronicles has the rhetorically weaker text³⁷⁰, but both texts exemplify ancient editors' desire to justify God's behaviour.³⁷¹

The big questions are: Why did the deity become angry? Why did Uzzah die? Did Uzzah sin? Did David sin? Did both sin? Did neither sin? Who, if anyone, did anything, whatever it might be, wrong? Scholars offer these explanations for Yahweh's anger and Uzzah's death.³⁷²

- Yahweh killed Uzzah because of David's hubris. The king illegitimately sought to transfer the ark for religio-political purposes. He acted with ambition, presumption, calculation, manipulation. Yahweh's message to David and Israel is that the deity cannot be controlled by any human being. Furthermore, Chronicles implicates all Israel in the hubristic transfer since the people took part in the decision to do so.
- Yahweh killed Uzzah because David failed to involve the Levites in the ark transfer. There is no evidence that Uzzah was a Kohathite Levite, which he should have been according to cultic law (Num. 3.29-31; 4.5-6, 15; 7.9; Deut. 10.8; 31.9, 25). In addition, Chronicles explicitly makes this point in the expansive treatment on levitical preparation and participation in the second attempt to transfer the ark (1 Chron. 15.2-28). The unfortunate incident permits the Chronicler to develop further a theology of immediate retribution.
- Yahweh killed Uzzah because David disregarded the ark's proper method of transport. He had the ark transported on a cart rather than with poles, carried on the shoulders of the Kohathite Levites (Exod. 25.12-15; 35.12; 37.5; 39.35; Num. 4.5-6, 15; 7.9). Again, Chronicles explicitly makes this point (1 Chron. 15.13, cf. 15.2, 15, 26), and it *could* be the implication of several differences in Samuel's continuation of the ark transfer story. Furthermore, transport by cart is ritually undesirable or disagreeable to God, because it was a solution used first by the uncircumcised Philistines. Some blame may have attached to Uzzah and his family, since for years they had been in charge of the ark and should have known better.

³⁷⁰ Murray 1998: 59, 124.

³⁷¹ The writer suggests that similar exculpatory theologising is worked out in the former ark narrative, where MT Samuel attempts to account for the smiting by appeal to cultic taboo (cf. Num. 4.20). LXX 1 Sam. 6.19 says that some Israelites were struck down when they saw the return of the ark and failed to join in on the celebration (καὶ οὐκ ἡσμένισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰερχομου ἐν τοῖς ἀνδράσιν Βαιθσαμυς ὅτι εἶδαν [τῆς] καβωτὸν [τοῦ] κυρίου); but the MT says they were struck down because they looked into the ark of Yahweh (כִּי רָאוּ יְהוָה בְּאֶרְוֶן יְהוָה).

³⁷² The writer omits citations of adherents since more than sixty are represented in this list.

- Yahweh killed Uzzah because of Uzzah's familiarity with the ark. Uzzah acted with presumption, contempt, mistrust, profanity, irreverence. God can take care of his own, and doesn't need faithless human assistance. The ark cannot be treated casually, and according to law should never be touched (Num. 4.15), especially by someone who may not even be a priest. Uzzah's instinct is outdone by the consummate behaviour of the draught animals in 1 Sam. 6.12, who hold their Creator in higher esteem than their maternal instinct (to echo Isa. 1.3).
- Yahweh killed Uzzah because Uzzah (unintentionally) frustrated the divine will by his failure to recognise that the falling of the ark was a sign indicating Yahweh's desire to halt the procession.
- Uzzah was killed because he and the procession happened upon a sacred site possessed by a(n evil) spirit. The story retains a relic of some primitive animistic belief.
- Uzzah was killed because of a ritual accident. The ark partook of God's numinous holiness which could and did break out with destructive force against any unconsecrated person who offended. A very holy object is also very dangerous, and utmost care is needed in its manipulation. The story illustrates holiness contagion.
- Uzzah was killed because the forces of man or nature simply had their way. A member of the ark's military escort used his spear to dispatch Uzzah. Uzzah was crushed when the ark moved backward and fell on him. Uzzah was horrified at his own action, and overcome by fear suffered a heart attack. Uzzah slipped on dung, hit his head on the hard rock surface, and died. Uzzah was electrocuted by the strong static electricity of the (gold overlaid) ark, which it picked up as it bumped along the rocky road (!).

The strongest argument for the *failure* of David and/or Uzzah is the explicit legal statements concerning the transport of the ark using poles carried on the shoulders of levitical attendants.³⁷³ If cultic law was broken, then Yahweh's outbreak against Uzzah could be justified on a legal basis. Blatant sin brings swift judgment. The argument based on legal infringement is pervasive, and few fail to cite the Pentateuchal legislation. However, this view faces several difficulties.³⁷⁴ First, the perspective presupposes a relative chronology of legislation on the proper transfer of the ark. In actual fact, the story of Uzzah's death may have led to the genesis of later legal tradition.

³⁷³ Exod. 25.12-15; 35.12; 37.5; 39.35; Num. 3.29-31; 4.5-6, 15; 7.9; Deut. 10.8; 31.9, 25

³⁷⁴ Sunoo 1999: 69-74.

At the very least, uncertainty about the relative dating of legal and narrative texts such as these precludes a compelling argument that Uzzah was supposed to have violated one or more specific commandments.³⁷⁵

Second, if one insists that some form of legal tradition prohibiting the touching of holy objects predated the story of Uzzah's death, there is still evidence elsewhere in Samuel that those who touched the holy things did not always die. For example, in 1 Sam. 4.17; 5.1-2; 6.11, none of the Philistines were struck dead for presumably touching the ark; and in 1 Sam. 21.6, David eats the bread of the presence. Furthermore,

The ark was handled at the start of the journey ..., patently by Uzza and Ahio ..., and that with undeniable impunity. Furthermore, as a result of the present incident, David will have it deposited (... actual handlers unspecified) in the house of Obed Edom, also with impunity. Finally, at the journey's eventual end the reader will see the ark installed ..., again with impunity, and that by anonymous attendants ..., whose cultic fitness to handle the ark is thus nowhere made as evident as that of Uzza.³⁷⁶

Third, if it were clearly understood to be a sin to carry the ark on a cart, then

someone would have had to be punished for this breach of divine law. But then why would Uzzah have been the one to be killed since any number of individuals might have been responsible for placing the ark of God on the cart?³⁷⁷

Fourth, the implication of several differences in Samuel's continuation of the ark transfer story (2 Sam. 6.13-14) may have nothing to do with a previous violation of legal tradition. See 5.1.3.3. It is readily admitted that 1 Chron. 15.2-28 addresses the issue of the failed transfer, however, Chronicles' *expansion* is unparalleled in Samuel, and 1 Chronicles 15 *is not* 1 Chronicles 13. Fifth, following up on the first point, it is remarkable that priests and Levites are explicitly absent from 2 Samuel 6 (and indeed the *shared* version of the story), while they are transparently present in the stories about the crossing of the Jordan (Joshua 3-4), the conquest of Jericho (Joshua 6), the former ark narrative (1 Samuel 4-7),

³⁷⁵ Sunoo 1999: 71; cf. Kirkpatrick 1881: 291; Murray 1998: 124-125; Schniedewind 1999b: 177.

³⁷⁶ Murray 1998: 125-126.

³⁷⁷ Sunoo 1999: 71.

and Solomon's installation of the ark in the temple (1 Kings 8 // 2 Chronicles 5–6), as well as in Josh. 8.33 and 1 Kgs. 2.26, and even 2 Sam. 15.24-29.

With justification, then, a few recognise that Yahweh's homicidal anger against Uzzah is inexplicable. There is no sin in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13. Gelanders perspective on the theological message of 2 Samuel 6 was discussed in 1.2.2. The important point is that he unequivocally disavows any error on David's or Uzzah's part:

In the description the only thing that is out of place is the apparently unreasonable outburst of the Lord's wrath, and it seems to me most reasonable to regard this as having no cause or explanation. Like other outbursts of wrath or other manifestations of 'the dark side of the Deity', here too we have a manifestation of God's demonic aspect. However, this is not the main point of the text, which is rather David's reaction. From it we learn not only that David turned 'the Lord's wrath into blessing', but that he was bringing the Ark up to Jerusalem after it had been 'cleansed' and could no longer do any harm. The symbolism of bringing the Ark up to Jerusalem is complex. Clearly the story tells us not only that David promises the continued sanctification of ancient traditions by adopting their symbols, but also that adopting these symbols marks a turning-point, since he uproots from them elements that he regards as undesirable. As I have indicated above in the Introduction, what we see here is a substantive change in the perception of the Deity. The historiographer apparently wishes to ascribe something like a revolution to David and his work, namely, an attempt to establish belief in a Deity who can no longer be regarded as capricious, ill-tempered, wrathful.³⁷⁸

Sunoo's unpublished doctoral thesis seeks to elucidate the theological complexity and rich variety of biblical narrative by reading three 'unexpected disruptions' in the narrative landscape in conversation with the wisdom books of Job and Qoheleth. These passages are Exod. 4.24-26, 2 Sam. 6.6-11 and 2 Samuel 24. These passages are chosen since they fit the following paradigm:

- God bursts forth.
- God bursts forth violently.
- The victims are, so far as the text reveals, innocent.

³⁷⁸ Gelanders 1991: 44-46.

In successive chapters, she subjects each narrative to textual, contextual, and theological analysis. Reception history figures prominently in her discussions. In the case of each narrative, the history of reception (from ancient to modern times) is characterised by attempts to circumvent the theological question it raises: Why is no clear explanation offered for Yahweh's behaviour? In each case, three strategies emerge:

- Scholars deny that it was really Yahweh who burst forth.
- Scholars deny that what Yahweh did was in fact a sudden act.
- Scholars supply appropriate reasons for Yahweh's behaviour.

The history of scholarship on these passages has been profoundly influenced by the drive to find rationality, morality, and consistency in the character of Israel's God. A common strategy, for example, is the inclination to read these puzzling narratives in light of legal traditions (e.g., concerning circumcision, or the proper handling of the ark, or census-taking), which may or may not predate the narratives in which these laws were supposedly disobeyed.

These three stories share other features as well. For example, they contain enigmatic terminology and syntax, ambiguity and/or logical and chronological inconsistency, and two of the three have textual problems:

In two of the three narrative passages, a difficult word or phrase appears in the Hebrew text at a key point in the story. In the case of Exod 4:24-26, not only the identity but even the significance of a 'bridegroom of blood' (חַתָּן דָּמִים) in the plot is shrouded in mystery. In the case of 2 Sam 6:6-11, at the very point when the reader hopes to be told why Uzzah has suddenly been killed, there appears in the MT the untranslatable expression *עַל־הַשֵּׁל*. Traditional interpretations of each passage have proceeded from the assumption that behind these difficult Hebrew expressions lie clues as to why the human victims in the stories meet their respective fates. Since Yahweh would never burst forth against anyone without just cause, the logic goes, perhaps the Hebrew text itself ought to be translated in such a way that it offers a reason – a neglected circumcision, for instance (in the case of Exod 4:24-26), or the violation of a clear rule concerning the handling of the ark (in the case of 2 Sam 6:6-11). Once prior assumptions about the rationality and predictability of divine behavior are set aside, however, it appears equally

plausible that the Hebrew text betrays no comprehensible motive on Yahweh's part in either of these two situations.³⁷⁹

In her analysis of the Uzzah story, Sunoo rightly focuses her textual analysis on the enigmatic שמור and על-השל. Her contextual analysis focuses on the reading of the story in light of biblical traditions concerning the transportation of the ark and/or within the context of biblical traditions concerning the touching of holy objects. Her theological analysis surveys the attempts to circumvent the theological problem of Yahweh's behaviour:

- Naturalistic explanations.
- Explanations that soften the language of the text, made by interpreters reluctant to note the fierceness of David's reaction, and whose aim is to show that David had no right to be angry at Yahweh because Yahweh's actions are always just.
- Explanations that rationalise God's behaviour by suggesting that human error or sin is to blame.

This brief review of Sunoo's thesis is concluded with these citations:

... the danger for exegetes lies in the temptation ... to assume that Uzzah must have erred *because* God became angry and killed him. The logical fallacy proceeds as follows: (1) When humans sin, God punishes them. (b) Therefore, if God bursts forth against someone that individual must have done something to provoke God's wrath. The logic breaks down in at least two places, however. The second half (b) is nullified at the very least by the presence of the books of Job and Ecclesiastes in the Hebrew canon, books which insist that sometimes even blameless individuals suffer at the hands of God. Neither can the first half be maintained, simply by virtue of the number of times God offers opportunities for repentance before striking out against those who have committed crimes against God and one another. In other words, the very premise of the argument, (a), is nullified by divine grace. God's sovereignty means, among other things, that God is full of surprises, sometimes graciously forgiving when punishment is due, and sometimes apparently allowing or even causing unmerited suffering.³⁸⁰

Such efforts to supply human errors (errors unspecified in the MT) would be considered superfluous if the texts could simply be received in the light of a different biblical tradition, a tradition of dissent or protest. The alternate biblical paradigm of intra-wisdom critique may in fact be the best heuristic device for interpreting the theological perspectives espoused in Exod 4:24-26, 2 Sam 6:6-11,

³⁷⁹ Sunoo 1999: 110.

³⁸⁰ Sunoo 1999: 78.

and 2 Samuel 24. How differently these individual pericopes would be received if, rather than being examined exclusively in the light of the dominant theological paradigms of Exodus and the Deuteronomistic History, they were read in conversation with the wisdom books of Job and Ecclesiastes. Viewed from this alternate perspective, narrative characters who are victims of Yahweh's violent outbursts would be given the benefit of the doubt. The possibility would be more seriously entertained that Yahweh may have burst forth against faithful servants in these instances without warning and without just cause.³⁸¹

The present writer's intention is to highlight (1) the perceived inexplicability of God's wrath in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, (2) the drive by ancients and moderns to supply an explanation, and (3) the relationship of that driving desire to the textual variation in the ark narrative's portrayal of Uzzah's slaughter. This thesis will not discuss Yahweh's 'dark, shadow, dreadful, sinister, amoral, savage, pernicious, cruel, hostile, demonic, satanic' side. God's 'violent outbursts of destructive fury and incomprehensible wrath'³⁸² and 'inexplicable caprice'³⁸³ are addressed elsewhere.³⁸⁴ Crenshaw in particular has skilfully written on theodicy³⁸⁵, and on anthropodicy whereby God's justice is salvaged by placing the blame on humans.³⁸⁶ These topics are taken up in a series of essays in honour of Crenshaw³⁸⁷ and in particular within that volume in an essay by Steussy, in which she addresses 'the problematic God of Samuel' by examining 'God's inner life', 'God's "walk"', 'God's talk' and 'God-talk from human characters' in the book.³⁸⁸ She shows that the characterisation depicts a God of strong likes and dislikes, wrathful and destructive, more inclined to anger than love, more adept at terrorising and smiting than at healing and encouraging. She goes on to suggest that her observations

³⁸¹ Sunoo 1999: 115-116.

³⁸² Gelernder 1991: 25.

³⁸³ Herion 1992: 993.

³⁸⁴ On Samuel see Gelernder 1991: 25-28; Sunoo 1999: 1-30. More generally see Cover 1992: 38; Herion 1992: 993; Kaufmann 1960: 74-76; Whybray 2000.

³⁸⁵ Crenshaw 1983b, 1984, 1992.

³⁸⁶ Crenshaw 1983a.

³⁸⁷ Penchansky and Redditt 2000.

³⁸⁸ Steussy 2000.

help free us from the automatic assumption that the picture in Samuel must be pro-David and pro-God. They raise the possibility that the Samuel narratives do not attempt to create bright legend from murky fact but may instead deliberately *darken* an existing legend.³⁸⁹

This view should be entertained by all, and will be welcomed by some, but insofar as 2 Sam. 6.7 is concerned, the opposite is true: the text is anti-Uzzah, and consequently pro-Yahweh and pro-David.

Sunoo says 'a single translational difficulty has thus revealed the central theological problem of the text', and she suggests that the original Hebrew version may have lacked a rationale for Uzzah's death, and also that early readers may have been bothered by this and so they supplied one.³⁹⁰ This conclusion is supported by the present analysis. Although biblical editors allowed the Uzzah episode to remain as part of the canonical portrayal of Israel's God, they did not allow it to remain without intervention. Just as modern scholars strive to make sense of this narrative, so did medieval scholars, and the ancients before them, but separating us from them is the textual permanence and canonical status of the Bible, which we cannot adjust, but which the early transmitters of the traditions adjusted freely when it seemed necessary to do so. See 2.3.

4.1.2.3	2 Sam. 6.7 1 Chron. 13.10	// וימת שם עם ארון האלהים וימת שם לפני אלהים
---------	------------------------------	---

Did Uzzah die 'next to the ark of God/Yahweh' (MT Samuel, LXX Samuel #1)³⁹¹ or 'before God' (4QSam^a, LXX Samuel #2, Chronicles)?³⁹² Some argue (unjustifiably) that the Chronicler intentionally heightened the narrative by personalising the deity, conceivably as an expression of post-exilic monotheism. However, many conclude that Greek Samuel has a conflated text retaining two synonymous readings, and that this

³⁸⁹ Steussy 2000: 158.

³⁹⁰ Sunoo 1999: 68-69.

³⁹¹ On ע as 'beside, next to' see *BDB* 768.

³⁹² See appendix 2.

evidence (1) releases Chronicles from the accusation of tendentious modification of its *Vorlage*, and (2) suggests that Chronicles' reading is in fact original.³⁹³ McCarter says 'the reading of MT Sam is reminiscent of v. 4' and he rejects it on the basis of assimilation³⁹⁴, whereas for Murray *עם ארון האלהים* is 'a more graphic representation, which links better with v. 4'.³⁹⁵ Both are correct—and both stray by failing to recognise the significance of the persistent doublet throughout MT 2 Sam. 6.3-4, 7. According to MT Samuel, Uzzah is located 'next to the ark of God' and 'before God'. MT Samuel reflects a conflated and extensively reworked version of several traditions. See 3.1.5.2. Treballe Barrera says:

A similar double reading is to be found in v. 7b. The MT of Samuel has here *עם ארון האלהים*, while the parallel in Chronicles reads *לפני אלהים*. The Septuagint in Samuel has a conflated reading: *παρὰ ἧς εὐδωβτα τοῦ σολύου ἐν τοῦ σολύου*. We have, therefore, two traditions relating the manner in which the ark had been transported. Each member of the presumed dittography in the MT introduces the text of one of the two traditions.³⁹⁶

4.1.3 David's Response

4.1.3.1	2 Sam. 6.8 1 Chron. 13.11	// ויחר לדוד על אשר פרץ יהוה פרץ בעזה ויחר לדוד כי פרץ יהוה פרץ בעזא
---------	------------------------------	---

The Hebrew versions of 2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11 vary on two points: (1) the preposition introducing the causal clause: *על אשר* in Samuel and *כי* in Chronicles³⁹⁷; (2) the orthography of 'Uzzah': *עזה* in Samuel and *עזא* in Chronicles. The statement *פרץ יהוה* *פרץ בעזה/א* will be discussed together with *פרץ עזה/א* in the next section.

The writer suggested that Yahweh's anger expressed by X *חרה אף* Y (2 Sam. 6.7 // 1 Chron. 13.10) and David's anger expressed by Y *חרה ל* (2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11) are *not* qualitatively different; rather, the latter is a *stylistic* circumlocution for the

³⁹³ Nysse 1984: 473-474; Ulrich 1978: 198-200; the commentaries.
³⁹⁴ McCarter 1984: 165.
³⁹⁵ Murray 1998: 60.
³⁹⁶ Treballe Barrera 1992c: 321.
³⁹⁷ See appendix 3. The variation is stylistic, although the direction of the change is uncertain.

maintenance of reverence. Many, however, feel compelled to mitigate David's anger against Yahweh, and they adopt one of three strategies to accomplish this. First, some render חרה as David 'was/became annoyed, despondent, disheartened, displeased, distressed, disturbed, frustrated, grieved, ill-humoured, troubled, vexed'.³⁹⁸ Second, some direct David's anger against *something else*, such as the interruption of his plan, or toward *someone other than Yahweh*, such as David's advisers, for failing to instruct him on the proper method of transport, or even against David himself. Third, on the basis of ἀθυμέω in the Greek translations some wish to emend MT 2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11 to ויחרד ('tremble, be terrified'), וימר ('be bitter') or ויצר ('be hard pressed, depressed'). Nevertheless, Hebrew usage and Greek translation technique back the standard interpretation that David is truly angry with Yahweh. The seven constructions with the G stem of חרה were reviewed above. It is impossible here to give a complete account of biblical usage. The important points are these: (1) Most often Yahweh is the angry one, and almost always against Israel or an Israelite. (2) Frequently a person is angry with another person, and in these cases a superior is almost always angry with an inferior. (3) In the few cases when a person expresses anger with Yahweh the construction is inevitably Y ל חרה and Yahweh is the *implied* object: Cain is angry with Yahweh when he does not receive his sacrifice (Gen. 4.5-6). Samuel is angry with Yahweh because of the deity's change of heart regarding the kingship of Saul (1 Sam. 15.11). David is angry with Yahweh over the homicide of Uzzah (2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11). Jonah is angry with Yahweh because he has mercy on the Ninevites (Jonah 4.1, 4, 9). The Greek translation paves the way for modern scholars who wish to avoid anger altogether in these passages. Contra Nysse, ἀθυμέω is not synonymous to חרה; rather, it is a euphemistic substitution which aims to create a theologically less offensive passage, as Ulrich

³⁹⁸ See, e.g., the following modern English translations: ASV, DRA, JPS, KJV, NAB, NJB, TNK, but not ESV, NASB, NIV, NKJV, NRSV, RSV, which retain 'angry'.

substantially later than the events narrated therein.⁴⁰³ In any case Samuel and Chronicles agree on the text of the passage.

The story says Yahweh burst out against Uzzah and consequently the place received the name Perez-uzzah or 'the breach of Uzzah'. What is the motive for this naming? McCarter gives genealogical and geographical explanations for Perez-uzzah (a break in Uzzah's family line and a breach in the fortifications of Jerusalem, respectively)⁴⁰⁴, and Zakovitch offers a religious perspective (a monument to the miracle wrought there)⁴⁰⁵, but possible associations with several other stories are noteworthy. Astonishingly few mention Yahweh's warning in Exod. 19.22, 24, and one certainly wonders about the direction of influence if a connection is intended. Langston thinks פרץ refers back to Judg. 21.15,

where Yahweh was said to have made a פרץ among the tribes of Israel [עשה יהוה] ... Both events underscore the illegitimacy of any Benjaminite claims to cultic dominance since Yahweh has demonstrated that even he is against their control.⁴⁰⁶

⁴⁰³ The formula עד היום הזה occurs 84 times, and is employed with the ark seven times, more than with any other object or institution. Childs 1963 is the seminal essay. After briefly reviewing the groundwork laid by Alt, Bright, and Noth, Childs summarises the basic etiological and non-etiological uses of עד היום הזה and related formulas, and then continues with a detailed analysis of seven categories of usage. He considers the formula in 2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11 an example of an etymological etiology. He reaches three conclusions: (1) 'In the great majority of cases, the formula "until this day," has been secondarily added as a redactional commentary on existing traditions'. (2) 'The formula reflects the age of many different redactors'. (3) 'The biblical formula, עד היום הזה, seldom has an etiological function of justifying an existing phenomenon, but in the great majority of cases is a formula of personal testimony added to, and confirming, a received tradition'. Geoghegan 1999 thoroughly reviews the history of interpretation and use of the formula. Geoghegan 2003 is a summary of his research. Geoghegan acknowledges Child's first point, but argues instead that in the DH the formula belongs to the pre-exilic Deuteronomistic historian (Dtr¹), not to numerous redactors from diverse time periods. Geoghegan has written a helpful study, but his thesis suffers several faults, including especially his two paragraph treatment in an appendix of Chronicles. He argues that the five non-shared occurrences of עד היום הזה in Chronicles 'belonged to a preexilic, perhaps Deuteronomistic, source that was used by the Chronicler in constructing his history' but which the Deuteronomistic historians decided to eliminate from their final composition (!).

⁴⁰⁴ McCarter 1984: 170; cf. Carlson 1964: 84.

⁴⁰⁵ Zakovitch 1992: 856.

⁴⁰⁶ Langston 1998: 192-193. The distribution of the root פרץ in the Former Prophets is interesting: Judg. 21.15 (noun); 1 Sam. 3.1 (N); 25.10 (HtD); 28.23 (G); 2 Sam. 5.20 (G, noun); 6.8 (G, noun); 13.25 (G), 27 (G); 1 Kgs. 11.27 (noun); 2 Kgs. 5.23 (G); 14.13 (G); cf. מפרץ in Judg. 5.17 and פצר in Judg. 19.7; 1 Sam. 15.23; 2 Kgs. 2.17; 5.16. A close look suggests that Judg. 21.15 and 2 Sam. 5.20; 6.8 are related.

In the nearer context the occurrence of the root פָּרַץ seven times in 2 Sam. 5.20 // 1 Chron. 14.11 and 2 Sam. 6.8 // 1 Chron. 13.11 is hardly coincidental. For some, the link comments largely on Uzzah (and his family), who is implicitly compared with the enemies of Israel.⁴⁰⁷ For others, the negative spotlight falls on David; and his anger, naming, fear and refusal are part and parcel of his 'inchoate realization that Yahweh's will and power, far from being at his disposal, may even be set against him'.⁴⁰⁸ In light of previous discussion of the inexplicability of Yahweh's homicidal anger against Uzzah it is suggested that the naming makes a pointed comment about the deity. To adopt the words of Polzin,

As the presence of the ark was first harmful to Philistines but then mysteriously noxious to Israelites themselves in 1 Samuel 4-6, so here in 2 Samuel 5-6 the LORD first bursts forth against the Philistines but then mysteriously erupts against an Israelite.⁴⁰⁹

Finally, several link the name 'Uzzah' and the noun עָז in [2 Sam. 6.5 //] 1 Chron. 13.8 and 2 Sam. 6.14 [// 1 Chron. 15.27]. The root עָז, which is the nominal root of Uzzah's name, occurs three times in MT Samuel: in 1 Sam. 2.10, where it is an attribute given by Yahweh to the king; in 2 Sam. 6.14; and in 2 Sam. 22.18, where the adjective עָז is applied to David's enemy Saul from whom Yahweh delivered David. With the exception of other proper names containing עָז, the root appears in MT Chronicles in 1 Chron. 13.8, and in 1 Chron. 16.11, 27, 28; 2 Chron. 6.41 where it is an attribute of Yahweh. It also appears in 2 Chron. 30.21 where it modifies musical 'instruments'. Auld offers astute observations on עָז in 2 Samuel 6:

The place name (6:8) that commemorates the worrying incident has an interesting double resonance. The Perez part of Perez-uzzah refers to the same sort of eruption or breakthrough as was celebrated in the previous chapter at Baal-perazim, where the Deity broke through the enemy like a flood (5:20). And the

⁴⁰⁷ Caquot and de Robert 1994: 416; Carlson 1964: 84; McCarter 1984: 170; Seow 1989: 99-102.

⁴⁰⁸ Murray 1998: 157; cf. 235; also see McConville 1984: 39.

⁴⁰⁹ Polzin 1993: 63-64.

Uzza part reminds us of the Hebrew word for might. The same word is used to describe the enthusiasm or strength of David's dancing (v. 14). This word 'oz is often associated with Yahweh, and memorably with his ark in the psalm which celebrates David's efforts to find a dwelling place for the Almighty: 'Arise, O Yahweh, and go to thy resting place, thou and the ark of thy might' (Ps 132:8). Baal-perazim is translated 'Lord of breakthroughs.' Perez-uzzah is ambiguous: it could, in the spirit of the psalm, suggest 'Breakthrough of Might'; but it is understood in our story as 'Breakthrough on Uzzah'. The versions we read in Samuel and Chronicles were not the only biblical recollections of the arrival of the ark.⁴¹⁰

The name עֹז־אֱלֹהִים means 'Oh [Yahweh or God, my] Strength' and is a short form related to the names Uzziah/Uzziel, 'Yahweh/El (God) is my Strength'.⁴¹¹ Ironically, then, Yahweh becomes angered (חָרָה) and strikes down (נָכָה) 'Oh [Yahweh or God, my] Strength'. Consequently, Yahweh's breakthrough (פָּרַץ) against 'Oh [Yahweh or God, my] Strength' incites David's anger (חָרָה) and the place of the irruption is memorialised as פָּרַץ עֹז־אֱלֹהִים, 'breakthrough of/on "Oh [Yahweh or God, my] Strength"'. As Auld observes, the name is ambiguous, and the second element could be interpreted as a subjective or objective genitive, although the latter is indicated by פָּרַץ בְּעֹז־אֱלֹהִים earlier in the verse. However, this may not end the story. It is difficult not to make a connection between Yahweh's mysterious and inexplicable homicidal anger against עֹז־אֱלֹהִים and David's response with עָוָה.⁴¹² Is David 'strength' *redivivus*? Or is David 'strong' *in spite of* Yahweh's breakthrough against 'Oh [Yahweh or God, my] Strength'? Gelandner says:

The events that occurred in the house of Obed-edom the Gittite can be interpreted as a victory won by David. Moreover, the feeling that it is David who is doing the reprimanding also comes from the description of his initial reaction: 'And David was angry because the Lord had broken forth upon Uzzah' (2 Sam. 6:8); and 'So David was not willing to take the ark of the Lord into the city of David; but David took it aside... (2 Sam. 6:10). These expressions suggest that the initiative and the decision were David's. ... Thus all the indications are that the text is emphasizing David's initiative and his control of the situation. ... Like other outbursts of wrath or other manifestations of 'the dark side of the Deity', here too we have a manifestation of God's demonic aspect. However, this is not the main point of the

⁴¹⁰ Auld 2003: 233.

⁴¹¹ Thompson 1992b: 776.

⁴¹² Notice that whereas David dances with עָוָה prior to the Uzzah incident in MT Chronicles he does so *after it in MT Samuel*.

text, which is rather David's reaction. From it we learn not only that David turned 'the Lord's wrath into blessing', but that he was bringing the Ark up to Jerusalem after it had been 'cleansed' and could no longer do any harm.⁴¹³

4.1.3.3 2 Sam. 6.9

1 Chron. 13.12

// וירא דוד את־יהוה ביום ההוא
וירא דויד את־האלהים ביום ההוא

The versions deviate solely over יָהוה in Samuel and הָאֱלֹהִים in Chronicles.⁴¹⁴ יָרָא occurs 64 times, most frequently in Psalms, Kings and Deuteronomy. The concept appears elsewhere in Samuel only in 1 Sam. 12.14, 24, where Samuel exhorts Israel to 'fear' and serve and obey Yahweh, and in Chronicles only in 2 Chron. 6.31, 33 (// 1 Kgs. 8.40, 43). יָרָא (אֵת) הָאֱלֹהִים occurs 18 times, but only here in Chronicles, and never in Samuel. יָרָא (אֵת) יָהוה is certainly not a Deuteronomistic addition⁴¹⁵ since David's fear is unrelated to 'fearing Yahweh' as a facet of maintaining loyalty to the God of the covenant. David's fear is 'fear associated with terror', not fear associated with respect or worship.⁴¹⁶ Apart from Jonathan's reassurance to David (1 Sam. 23.17) this is the only other occasion where the verb יָרָא is applied to David. Even the dangerous rebellion of his son Absalom, from whom David flees for his life, is not said to induce fear in David. For most commentators, David's fear is the recognition of his (supposed) fault, and some nuance it as 'respect'. Others, more acceptably, relate David's anger to Yahweh's mysterious and inexplicable homicidal anger. 'David is afraid ... realizing that he is in the presence of a mysterious power he can neither control nor comprehend'.⁴¹⁷ Sunoo says:

Indeed, why would David react with fear, and insist that the ark remain far from his presence, unless he was horrified at what had happened to Uzzah and feared the destructive power of God might again be unleashed without warning? David's

⁴¹³ Gelandner 1991: 43-44.

⁴¹⁴ See appendix 2.

⁴¹⁵ Contra, e.g., Caquot and de Robert 1994: 416.

⁴¹⁶ Van Pelt and Kaiser 1997: 528-529.

⁴¹⁷ Allen 1999: 386.

reaction to Uzzah's death could imply that David himself was believed to have felt God's outburst against Uzzah to have been an arbitrary, capricious act.⁴¹⁸

Similarly, Josephus' *Antiquities* 7.4.2 suggests that David was fearful at the thought that he might suffer the same fate as Uzzah.

4.1.3.4 2 Sam. 6.9
1 Chron. 13.12

וַיֹּאמֶר אֵיךְ יָבוֹא אֵלַי אֲרוֹן יְהוָה //
לֵאמֹר הֵיךְ אָבִיָא אֵלַי אֶת אֲרוֹן הָאֱלֹהִים

The principal witnesses to both Samuel and Chronicles agree against MT Samuel's finite verb וַיֹּאמֶר. In addition, for every *wayyiqtol* verb followed by אָמַר in MT Samuel and Chronicles, Samuel (3::1) has a greater tendency than Chronicles (2::1) to have the *wayyiqtol* form of אָמַר. To these facts one may add the fact that on only three occasions does Chronicles have לֵאמֹר where Samuel–Kings has the *wayyiqtol* form of אָמַר. Consequently, the original reading in the passage is לֵאמֹר, and MT Samuel was adjusted due to stylistic preference. הֵיךְ and אֵיךְ are two of five interrogative adverbs for manner.⁴¹⁹ The others are מַה, אֵיכָכָה and אֵיכָכָה, the latter sometimes in combination with other elements, as in בְּמַה. This set of interrogative adverbs is seldom used to pose the ordinary question of manner 'how?'. The main uses are⁴²⁰:

- Introducing a simple question, 'how?', 'by what method?'.
- Introducing a rhetorical question, 'how is it possible that?', 'surely it is not possible that?'.
- As an interjection expressing enormity of catastrophe, typically within a lament, 'how terribly!'.

⁴¹⁸ Sunoo 1999: 77; cf. Polzin 1993: 64.

⁴¹⁹ See appendix 3.

⁴²⁰ *DCH* I, 208-209.

The primary function is rhetorical, and this is evident in about half of all occurrences. It is used to clarify that some event or state of affairs is out of the question. The nature of David's question is addressed below.⁴²¹

In Samuel, the question is 'how will Yahweh's ark come to me?', and in Chronicles, 'how will I bring God's ark to me?' Johnstone believes the alteration in Chronicles indicates 'The focus has changed from blind fear of the irrational to the necessary preparations which David knows he must make to receive the token of the very presence of God within his own residence'.⁴²² Dhorme says 'Il est clair que יבוא es plus primitif que יביא de I *Chr.*; d'ailleurs «j'amènerai vers moi» serait assez étrange'.⁴²³ Nysse thinks Chronicles clears up ambiguity regarding the subject of יבוא by using the first person.⁴²⁴ However, what is strange or ambiguous about the grammar or phraseology of either text? Barker says 'One is tempted to argue that this is the Chronicler's theology at work, heightening the centrality of David. However, with so many unknowns, it would seem best to relegate this to a stylistic variation'.⁴²⁵ Samuel probably has the original verb form, but there is no firm basis for deciding between the readings or identifying a rhetorical difference between them.

LXX^L Samuel and perhaps 4QSam^a (according to Herbert⁴²⁶) have the additional clause καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ κιβωτὸς τοῦ κυρίου / ויבוא ארון יהוה. Nysse considers the longer reading to be secondary⁴²⁷, whereas McCarter thinks it is original and all other witnesses were shortened by haplography.⁴²⁸ The longer reading is not a doublet, in agreement with both scholars. It may indicate that subsequent to Uzzah's homicide the ark continued its

⁴²¹ On the ark's epithets see appendix 2.

⁴²² Johnstone 1997: I, 172-173.

⁴²³ Dhorme 1910: 321-322.

⁴²⁴ Nysse 1984: 283.

⁴²⁵ Barker 1984: 112-113.

⁴²⁶ Herbert 1997b: 125.

⁴²⁷ Nysse 1984: 282-283.

⁴²⁸ McCarter 1984: 165.

movement to a point closer to the City of David, and was diverted by David at that time, to another location in 'greater Jerusalem'. A more certain element of the narrative is the repetition of the first person singular pronoun on each occasion of David's speaking in 2 Samuel 5–6 and in the synoptic parallels, except in 5.8 (but notice 'those whom David hates'): 'my hand' (5.19 // 14.10), 'my enemies' (5.20 // 14.11), 'come/bring to me' (6.9 // 13.12), 'chose me' (6.21). Furthermore, in 6.10 // 13.13 the goal of the transfer is ... אלי (י)ד על/אל-עיר דוד. Therefore, Steussy says David 'now speaks as if everything happens for his own sake. Will God correct the king's vision?'⁴²⁹, and Murray says 'The one whose first recourse in 5.17-25 was to consult Yahweh ... is now remarkably reluctant, even when brought up sharp by Yahweh, in any way to confide in him!'⁴³⁰ Conversely, David's unwillingness reflects his practical awareness that there is 'an unpredictable danger, a risk, in seizing the ark' and bringing it near him and his home.⁴³¹ Therefore, in the rhetoric of the passage, 'Surely it is not possible that the ark of Yahweh will come to me!' David was no less prudent than the people of Beth Shemesh (1 Sam. 6.20): Jerusalem and the Davidides were at stake!

4.1.3.5	2 Sam. 6.10 1 Chron. 13.13	// ולא־אבה דוד להסיר אליו את־ארון יהוה על־עיר דוד ולא־הסיר דויד את־הארון אליו אל־עיר דויד
---------	-------------------------------	--

The principal difference here is the variation between ולא־אבה ... להסיר in Samuel versus ולא־הסיר in Chronicles. For some, Chronicles' minus intentionally avoids attributing Samuel's unworthy motivation to David.⁴³² Was אבה deleted from Chronicles in order to make David look better? Does the presence or absence of אבה have an effect on the portrayal of David? The verb אבה occurs 54 times, always in the G stem, and then

⁴²⁹ Steussy 1999: 61.

⁴³⁰ Murray 1998: 129.

⁴³¹ Polzin 1993: 64; cf. 63.

⁴³² Barker 1984: 113 (cautiously); Murray 1998: 60.

twice as often in Samuel (14 times) as in any other book. It means 'will, want, consent, accept', but since in all but two cases (Isa. 1.19; Job 39.9) it is preceded by a negative adverb⁴³³, the resultant idea is 'refuse, decline, not want'. The term itself is neutral. It is used in contexts having a positive or negative tone. For example, *BDB* makes 1 Sam. 15.9; 2 Sam. 13.14, 16 'bad' uses, and 1 Sam. 22.17; 26.23; 31.4; 2 Sam. 6.10 'good' uses.⁴³⁴ B. Johnson discusses specific theological considerations, including (1) God as subject, (2) hardness of heart, and (3) as an attitude toward God. He does not place 2 Sam 6.10 in either (2) or (3).⁴³⁵ He also says 'The primary emphasis here is not on the intention as a psychological factor in the inner man ... but on the main behavioral patterns and actions in which the intention is manifested'.⁴³⁶ In this context David's inner motivation is the anger and fear reported in the previous verses, neither of which should be construed as negatives about David. Finally, Murray considers Chronicles' minus 'terser and less characterful'⁴³⁷, and Fokkelman remarks that the sounds *yaboʿ ʿelay* in 2 Sam. 6.9 are picked up at the beginning of v. 10 by *weloʿ ʿaba ... ʿelaw*, which 'reinforces the lines' coherence'.⁴³⁸ Both points may argue for the originality of Samuel's text; however, both are also good reasons for a stylistic adjustment in Samuel.

The verb סור occurs nearly 300 times. The H form is usually translated 'cause to turn aside/depart, remove, eliminate, take away', and the object marker אה frequently follows the verb, as do the prepositions מן and מעל. Several factors may hint at the complicated editorial history of 2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13. For example, this is the only place where the preposition אל is used with the H of סור, and elsewhere the H of סור

⁴³³ Always לא, except for אין in the second of two occurrences of אבה in Ezek. 3.7, and except for אל in Prov. 1.10.

⁴³⁴ *BDB* 2. 2 Sam. 2.21; 12.17; 13.25; 14.29; 23.16, 17 are unclassified.

⁴³⁵ B. Johnson 1974: 26.

⁴³⁶ B. Johnson 1974: 24.

⁴³⁷ Murray 1998: 60.

⁴³⁸ Fokkelman 1990: 190.

is rarely accompanied by any comment on *to where* something is removed, and in the handful of passages where this information is given an additional verb follows. With respect to the usage of סור in general there are a remarkable number of textual difficulties in the MT, discrepancies in synoptic passages, and translation equivalents in the Greek version. These factors, which cannot be related in detail here, raise a question about what if any of the material prior to the ויטרו clause is original to the passage. Was David's unwillingness in the rhetorical question of 2 Sam. 6.9 // 1 Chron. 13.12 originally followed by 'and he diverted it to the house of Obed-edom the Gittite'? In any case, since סור does occur in both 2 Sam. 6.10 and 1 Chron. 13.13, it is more prudent to focus the discussion on the presence or absence of אבה.

The different locations of דו(י)ר and אליו in the texts are related to the diverse verb and object formulations.⁴³⁹ See appendix 2 for the variation in the ark's epithet. See 3.1.2.3 and appendix 3 on the interchange between אל and על. Here, MT Samuel's על is secondary.⁴⁴⁰ All versions agree on עיר דו(י)ר / πόλις Δαυίδ⁴⁴¹, which is in apposition to אליו / πρὸς αὐτόν/ἑαυτόν, thus furnishing 'to himself, to the city of David'. Although this construction may seem redundant, it is neither awkward nor necessarily a conflation or double reading.⁴⁴² Fokkelman says

The name Jerusalem has been clearly avoided, and systematically replaced by 'the city of David' (in triplicate; vv. 10a-12c-16a). This stresses the personal aspect of

⁴³⁹ Typical Hebrew word order is verb + א-phrase + אל-phrase when the object is compact, and verb + אל-phrase + א-phrase when the object is extended, so as to avoid distant separation and/or ambiguity.

⁴⁴⁰ Observe Samuel's אליו ... על-עיר דוד. MT Chronicles' אל, and εἰς in LXX Samuel and Chronicles, suggest that MT Samuel's על is secondary. In biblical Hebrew, על with an object of person or place following a verb of movement normally means 'upon' or 'against', and this cannot be the intended significance in 2 Sam. 6.10. Driver 1890: 268 says 'Read אל, as in I Ch. 13, 13'; cf. Dhorme 1910: 322.

⁴⁴¹ עיר דו(י)ר occurs 44 times in the MT, and only three times outside Samuel, Kings and Chronicles (Isa. 22.9; Neh. 3.15; 12.37). There are five occurrences in 2 Samuel (5.7, 9; 6.10, 12, 16) and five in 1 Chronicles (11.5, 7; 13.13; 15.1, 29). The remainder are in Kings (17 times) and 2 Chronicles (14 times).

⁴⁴² See, e.g., Gen. 8.9; Num. 10.3; Josh. 2.8; 11.7; Judg. 4.7; 2 Kgs. 10.15; Jer. 38.14; 48.44; 51.56; 2 Chron. 32.6.

the removal led by the king: he finds that the ark ought to be housed in the crown lands, and so be permanently connected with them.⁴⁴³

But 2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13 briefly reverses the truth of this appraisal: David refuses to bring Yahweh's ark 'to himself, to the city of David', and this locution hints at why he refuses Yahweh's presence for the moment: the deity is so dangerous and unpredictable that his presence could place in danger David and his city! After all, who can predict against whom Yahweh's homicidal anger might next erupt?

4.1.3.6	2 Sam. 6.10 1 Chron. 13.13	// וישמו דוד בית עבד־אדום הגתי וישמו אל־בית עבד־אדם הגתי
---------	-------------------------------	---

The H of נטה means 'turn (aside), steer sideways, guide away', is roughly equivalent to סור in the previous verse, and is generally construed with an accusative object and the prepositions מן, אל and על, but with an adverbial accusative of place here only. The grammar of both versions is acceptable, and the presence of εἰς in Greek Samuel does not necessarily suggest the loss of אל. The reading in Chronicles may be secondary. See 5.1.1.1. Only LXX^L Samuel has μῆνας τρεῖς in 2 Sam. 6.10 as well as in v. 11, where 'three months' appears in all versions. McCarter rightly concludes that the reading is 'the remnant of a long haplography from "the house of Obed Edom the Gittite" in v. 10 to "the house of Obed Edom the Gittite" in v. 11, which has been repaired (the restored material standing under the Hexaplaric asterisk in e₂)'.⁴⁴⁴

Much ingenuity is exercised in explaining David's entrusting the ark to 'Obed-edom the Gittite'. A surface reading suggests that the ark was sent to the house or temple of a (former or current?) servant of the god Edom, a man of Philistine Gath by birth. 'Edom' is interpreted as the name of a deity, a king, or a tribe, but few disfavour the theophoric interpretation: Edom is a particular deity. It is unclear whether Obed-edom is a

⁴⁴³ Fokkelman 1990: 180.

⁴⁴⁴ McCarter 1984: 165.

convert to Yahwism or whether he maintains allegiance to Edom. *גִּתִּי* (גִּתִּי) describes Obed-edom (2 Sam. 6.10, 11; 1 Chron. 13.13), Ittai (2 Sam. 15.19, 22; 18.2), and Goliath (2 Sam. 21.19; 1 Chron. 20.5), and is used generically as 'the Gittite' (Josh. 13.3) and 'the Gittites' (2 Sam. 15.18). *גַּת*, used five times as 'winepress', most often refers unambiguously to Philistine Gath (33 times), and this is especially true in Samuel. Consequently, *גִּתִּי* (גִּתִּי) cannot refer unambiguously to an individual from Gath-hepher (Josh. 19.13; 2 Kgs. 14.25—in Zebulun), Gath-rimmon (Josh. 19.45; 21.24, 25; 1 Chron. 6.54—in Dan) or Gittaim (2 Sam. 4.3; Neh. 11.33—in Benjamin). These Gaths (and other Gaths mentioned in Amarna correspondence) are modified precisely to distinguish them from one another. Of course, this means that the ark was sent into the care of a (former or current?) servant of a god other than Yahweh, whose origin was from among David's enemies the Philistines. The consensus is that Obed-edom was a Philistine *גַּת* from Gath who probably attached himself to David during David's period of mercenary service among the Philistines under 'King Achish of Gath' (1 Samuel 21, 27–31).

Some insist that Obed-edom was a Levite, by birth or possibly by adoption, but the consensus is that the Chronicler tendentiously gifted Obed-edom levitical status. There is no basis in 2 Sam. 6.10-12 // 1 Chron. 13.13-14; 15.25 for attributing levitical status to Obed-edom. Also, the Obed-edom in these passages and the Obed-edom in 2 Chron. 25.24 (the keeper of *בבית־האלהים ... כל־הכלים*; minus in 2 Kgs. 14.14) are different individuals, although Chronicles intends to link the latter to the family of the former.⁴⁴⁵ How is/are the Obed-edom(s) in Chronicles' non-synoptic material (1 Chron. 15.18, 21, 24; 16.5, 38; 26.4, 8, 15) related to the Obed-edom in the parallel material given above? The editorial history of the levitical personnel in 1 Chronicles 15–16 is complex, and by

⁴⁴⁵ Many believe this (non-shared) reference to Obed-edom is a post-Chronistic addition, e.g., Japhet 1993: 871; Rudolph 1955: 280; Williamson 1982: 331.

all accounts divergent layers of tradition are attested side by side.⁴⁴⁶ Obed-edom is presented as a gatekeeper (1 Chron. 15.18, 24; 16.38), a musician (1 Chron. 15.21; 16.5, 38—together with 68 brothers!), and a son of Jeduthun (1 Chron. 16.38). In addition, Obed-edom is a descendant of Levi through Korah, and the progenitor of a sizeable and qualified family of gatekeepers (1 Chron. 26.4, 8, 15—with 62 descendants, including 8 sons!). 'Obed-edom is not a conveniently expendable alien (cf. 1 Chron. 8.13, where the original population were driven out by Benjamin), but a Levite, one of the approved personnel'.⁴⁴⁷ 'The precise relationship between these four remains unclear due to the nature of the Chronicler's work where one or more families of temple servants claiming ties to the Philistine caretaker of the ark are given levitical ancestry'.⁴⁴⁸ In two in-depth studies Dirksen reviews scholarly opinion and seeks to explain the redactional growth of the Obed-edom traditions.⁴⁴⁹ He concludes:

Chronist	Later Redactor	Still Later Glossator
15.1-3		
	15.4-10	
15.11-16		
	15.17-18 (gatekeeper)	
15.19-24a (musician)		
	15.24b (gatekeeper)	
16.5 (musician)		
	16.38b (gatekeeper)	
		16.38a (musician) [misplaced]
		16.42
	chs. 23-27 (Williamson et al.)	

Dirksen sorts out the relationship of chapter 13 to chapters 15–16, 26 by arguing that the Obed-edom of the ark narrative (1 Chron. 13.13-14; 15.25) was elevated into a gatekeeper (1 Chron. 15.18, 21, 38b; 26.4, 8, 15), and that Obed-edom the musician (1 Chron. 15.21, 24; 16.5, 38a) was an altogether different person:

⁴⁴⁶ Braun 1986: 186-188, 190-191; Japhet 1993: 292-296, 311-313; Williamson 1982: 120-122.
⁴⁴⁷ Johnstone 1997: I, 173.
⁴⁴⁸ Thompson 1992a: 6.
⁴⁴⁹ Dirksen 1995, 1996.

The best is to begin with vs 21, which belongs to the Chronicler's own composition. In this verse Obed Edom is unambiguously listed as a singer, one among many. There is no reason to assume that this Obed Edom was thought by the Chronicler to be identical with the one in whose house the ark had remained for three months (I 13:14). If the Chronicler had any intention to elevate this Obed Edom to the rank of the (levitical) singers, he would at least have omitted the then embarrassing fact of his being a Gittite (I 13:13). Elsewhere, however, this Obed Edom is indeed elevated to the rank of a Levite, though not as a singer but as a prominent gatekeeper, who established a family of gatekeepers, viz. in I 26:4-9, which belongs to the secondary material in ch. 23-27. Now he is no longer a Gittite, but a Korahite (vs 1). That the writer is thinking of the Obed Edom of the ark narrative is clear from his allusion to that narrative in vs 5 «for God had blessed him». That as a Levite Obed Edom would be made a gatekeeper is much more natural than his becoming a singer, since he had actually been a gatekeeper *avant la lettre* during the three months the ark had been in his house.⁴⁵⁰

Samuel's and Chronicles' presentations differ remarkably on this point of the story, and Chronicles goes to great lengths to gift a levitical pedigree to Obed-edom (he had to be a Levite!—cf. Deut. 10.8 etc.—in defence of David?), but in the end:

The text is ambiguous and open-ended here, leaving the implicit tension unresolved. In any case, Chr's attempt to explain this possible inconsistency neither resolves nor conceals this problem, but merely heightens the degree of ambiguity that characterizes Israel's relationship with the Philistines. The presence of Obed-Edom among the levites remains a textual aporia.⁴⁵¹

Why did David redirect the ark to the house or temple of Obed-edom? The difficult question to answer is 'Why Obed-edom?'. Suggestions are:

- Expedient choice: Obed-edom's home was close (a quick exit from danger/embarrassment).
- Default choice: no Israelite would accept the dangerous thing.
- Test-case choice: David's thinking was 'better him (a Philistine!) than me; let's see what happens!'.⁴⁵¹
- Religious choice: Obed-edom had a בית ('temple').
- Narrative choice: this is yet another Philistine interlude in David's and the ark's story.

⁴⁵⁰ Dirksen 1995: 274-275.

⁴⁵¹ Siedlecki 1999: 247-249.

The easy answer is that the deity was too dangerous and unpredictable for David to bring Yahweh's ark into David's city near David and the Davidides!

Two points conclude this chapter. First, besides the close association between David and Philistine Gath, 2 Sam. 6.10-11 cannot effortlessly be taken independently of 1 Sam. 5.8-9, whatever the relationship between the two passages.⁴⁵² Second, Fokkelman's thought merits reflection:

But in any case an irony has come about; the God who has just been an extreme stickler for detail and very demanding of his priest now tolerates the housing of his ark in an uncircumcised man's residence thus behaving like a moderate towards, and even blessing, a man from another religion.⁴⁵³

'Gittite' in Samuel and Chronicles again highlights the enigmatic behaviour of Yahweh towards Uzzah.

4.2 Summary of Chapter Four

The material in 2 Sam. 6.6-7 // 1 Chron. 13.9-10 relates the story's inciting incident in which Yahweh executes Uzzah and thereby brings an abrupt albeit short-lived halt to David's relocation of the ark to Jerusalem. The writer remarks in 4.0 that many observe the problematic character of this material, which is characterised by textual variation, literary ambiguity, and theological difficulty. The principal text-critical and interpretative issues are: (1) All witnesses exclusive of LXX^B Chronicles (= OG) have a word modifying 'the threshing-floor'. The witnesses to Samuel in particular are marked by acute textual variation. Most mistakenly seek in the *nomina recta* a specific locale where the Yahweh–Uzzah incident transpired, but the route of the procession and the location of the threshing-floor are unknown. The expansive readings in Samuel and Chronicles were not intended as proper names. See 4.1.1.1. (2) The direct object phrase 'his hand' is absent

⁴⁵² McKane 1963: 208.

⁴⁵³ Fokkelman 1990: 192.

from MT Samuel only and it undoubtedly once stood in this textual tradition. The minus may be unintentional or perhaps intentional. See 4.1.1.2. (3) The indirect object of Uzzah's action is 'the ark of God' in Samuel but only 'the ark' in Chronicles. See 4.1.1.2. (4) The double and triple references to Uzzah's 'grasping' in Greek Samuel suggest that Chronicles' infinitive phrase is original; the finite verb phrase in MT Samuel is an intentional adjustment intended to stress Uzzah's slip-up. He is the culprit. See 4.1.1.2. (5) MT Samuel and Chronicles were stylistically updated by the insertion of 'nose' in the expression of Yahweh's anger. See 4.1.2.1. (6) Yahweh is the subject of the 'striking' in Chronicles but Samuel alters the subject to God, and following Fokkelman this adjustment generates a lack of insight on the part of Uzzah into the uniqueness of Yahweh the God of Israel. See 4.1.2.2. (7) LXX^B and a number of cursives of Samuel do not have an explanatory clause justifying Yahweh's homicide of Uzzah. This is the original reading. The ancient versions, and subsequent commentators to the present day, have struggled to comprehend Yahweh's behaviour. Gelandier and Sunoo, among others, place this text and its interpretation in proper perspective. See 4.1.2.2. (8) Uzzah's fuzzy position vis-à-vis the ark results from editors' efforts to situate him in the spot where he might suitably become the object of Yahweh's malice. See 4.1.2.3 and also 3.1.5.2. (9) Remarkably, the meaning of שמואל הבקר is unclear, and revisers did not seek to spell out its meaning, which however is irrelevant since Uzzah alone is responsible for his death. See 4.1.1.3.

The material in 2 Sam. 6.8-10 // 1 Chron. 13.11-13 is more certain and less difficult than the material just described; text-critical issues are minor. Samuel has the plus אבה. See 4.1.3.5. Chronicles has the plus אל preceding בית. See 4.1.3.6. Chronicles' אביא is (probably) secondary to Samuel's יבוא. See 4.1.3.4. Two issues occupy interpreters. First, exactly who is 'Obed-edom the Gittite' and why was the ark entrusted into his care?

Second, how should one construe David's response to Yahweh? Did he respond inappropriately, or are his anger and fear and his refusal to continue the transfer, understandable rejoinders to Yahweh's baffling slaughter of Uzzah? It is argued here that interpreters have naturally but mistakenly criticised David's behaviour and by so doing they have misunderstood the significance of David's triumph in the relocation of the ark. David really was angry, and he really was terrified, but ultimately he succeeded in settling the potent deity in a fixed abode.

Three themes which influenced the editing of MT Samuel are outlined in 3.2. How do these manifest themselves and sway the revision of MT 2 Sam. 6.6-10? First, the theme apology of Davidic kingship is relatively insignificant in this material in 2 Samuel 6. Second, the theme apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character stands in the foreground, but the story focuses less on the positive depiction of these characters than on the negative portrayal of Uzzah. Third, the theme influence of cultic practice is implied by שׁ in Samuel, a term which is used for cultic 'negligence' in Dan. 3.29; Ezra 6.9; 2 Chron. 29.11. Furthermore, ancients and moderns are inclined to interpret Uzzah's identity and behaviour in keeping with legal stipulations regarding the transport of the ark, but at best these are belated implications in the story. Finally, Obed-edom stands as a final highlight of the mysteriousness of Yahweh's behaviour towards Uzzah.

CHAPTER FIVE

Analysis of 2 Samuel 6.11-15, 17-20a and 1 Chronicles 13.14; 15.25-28; 16.1-3, 43

5.0 Introduction

The material in 2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8 (and 13.1-4) is the exposition of the main plot which presents information essential to the story. This is followed by the inciting incident in 2 Sam. 6.6-7 // 1 Chron. 13.9-10 which initiates the conflict or complication and in turn gives way to the rising action, which extends or develops the conflict. This material alternately conveys David's response to Yahweh's homicidal act (2 Sam. 6.8-10 // 1 Chron. 13.11-13), Yahweh's response to David's rejection (2 Sam. 6.11-12a // 1 Chron. 13.14), and David's response to Yahweh's blessing (2 Sam. 6.12b-15 // 1 Chron. 15.25-28). Following the unexpected introduction of an additional character in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 (which is developed further in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23), the story reaches its climax or turning point in which the outcome of the story is made clear: David successfully relocates the ark to its designated place in the capital Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6.17a // 1 Chron. 16.1a). Afterward, the main plot of the narrative is brought to a close in what may be denominated the resolution or denouement or falling action (2 Sam. 6.17b-20a // 1 Chron. 16.1b-3, 43 [and 16.4-42]).

This chapter will address the second and third parts of the rising action, the climax, and the resolution of the story. The sections in this chapter are:

5.1.1	5.1.2	5.1.3
Yahweh's Response to David's Rejection: Blessing	David's Response to Yahweh's Blessing: The Successful Removal of the Ark to Jerusalem	The Attendant Circumstances of the Ark's Transfer
2 Samuel 6.11-12a	2 Samuel 6.12b, 15a, 17a, 19b, 20aα	2 Samuel 6.12c-14, 15b, 17b, 18-19a, 20aβ
1 Chronicles 13.14	1 Chronicles 15.25a, 28a, 16.1a, 43a	1 Chronicles 15.25b-27, 28b, 16.1b-3, 43b

Material in 5.1.2 regarding the removal's completion alternates with elements in 5.1.3 relating the adjuncts accompanying David's success.

The analysis of the material in these portions of the story is abbreviated considerably. This abridgement is forced by the textual *and* interpretative difficulties in the passage. *The two issues go hand in hand*. Ancient editors and scribes preceded us long ago in the struggle to comprehend the significance of this material. The greater part of chapter 5 deals with the attendant circumstances of David's transfer of the ark—*David's*, because he and his kingly capacity are in focus. David's entourage is elaborated greatly in 2 Sam. 6.1-5 (and in 1 Chron. 13.5-8) in contrast to the focus on David in 2 Sam. 6.12b-20a, where the participants are mentioned briefly in v. 15 and then are presented in vv. 18-19 more as recipients of David's benevolence than as participants in his transfer of the ark. Observe, however, that 1 Chron. 15.25-16.3, 43 focuses less acutely on David. The occasion overall is marked by celebration and reverence. A joyful mood is set at the very start followed by descriptions of sacrifices, movements (dance), garments, noises (voices and instruments), blessings and gifts.

Most pay inadequate attention to the function of verbs in delimiting the passage's narrative structure. In particular, the story in 2 Sam. 6.12-20a // 1 Chron. 15.25-16.3, 43 focuses on the end points of the transfer: its start (the first steps) and finish (the ascent and entrance). The attendant circumstances which are described accompany the ark's

departure and arrival. The interval between these points is left undescribed, thus eliminating any potential doubt regarding David's accomplishment.

The narrative in 2 Samuel 6 is structured by (1) a large number of movement verbs together with (2) significant pauses in activity (vv. 6b-10a, 11-12a, 17b-19a, 20b-23) and (3) verbal spotlights. The latter are fashioned by predicative participles in vv. 3-5 and 14-16. These do not describe David's and the people's activity throughout the duration of the transport of the ark. Such an interpretation misconstrues the participles as finite rather than circumstantial.⁴⁵⁴

- נהגים in v. 3 is circumstantial to וישארו in the same verse. This verse asserts the punctiliar departure of the ark and relates the attendants' (*their*) position relative to it.
- הלך in v. 4 is circumstantial to וישארו in the same verse. This verse asserts the punctiliar departure of the ark and relates the attendant's (*his*) position relative to it. The doublet in vv. 3-4 is discussed in 3.1.5.2. Neither וישארו (twice) nor נהגים and הלך refer to activity during a period of travel from Abinadab's בית to the threshing floor.
- משחקים in v. 5 is circumstantial to ויבאו in v. 6, and is intended to describe the activity of David and Israel as they arrived at the threshing floor. The participles in v. 5 and vv. 14-15 function similarly: attendant circumstance at an arrival.

⁴⁵⁴ (1) *Qotel* forms have adjective, substantive, relative, predicate, and periphrastic uses, but the periphrastic use is reliant on a finite verb (היה), and the predicate use is generally circumstantial in biblical narrative, with true finite verb function limited to statements about the present–future in discursive texts. In biblical narrative the participle as predicate frequently occurs in circumstantial clauses. In these instances, the participle does not make an independent statement (primary) but a dependent comment (secondary). In general, the primary storyline of biblical narrative is carried along by a series of *wayyiqtol* forms. The secondary or subsidiary storyline, the background or circumstantial information which supplements and sets the stage for the main events, is often described with participial forms of the verb, and frequently introduced using disjunctive syntax. The *wayyiqtol* forms may be equated with the big picture, the view of an entire parade from the blimp above (perfective aspect), whereas the participles place the reader in the grandstands alongside the passing parade, giving an up-close and personal view (imperfective aspect). The two viewpoints are not mutually exclusive and normally occur together in good story-telling. The *wayyiqtol* forms keep one turning the pages of the book; the participles are the pauses to look at the pictures. (2) The participles in 2 Samuel 6 are frequently yet inconsistently rendered as finite verbs in modern versions and in translations in commentaries. (3) The vividness conveyed by the participles in this material is described by Campbell 1975: 138; Driver 1892: §135 [I], p. 166; Kleven 1991: 373; 1992: 309; Murray 1998: 134; Polzin 1993: 61.

- V. 12 is a synopsis of the transport of the ark to the city of David. The entire event and its mood are summarised in a single initial statement.
- V. 13 focuses on the departure of the ark and the commencement sacrifice.
- מְכַרְכֵּר in v. 14, and מְכַרְכֵּר and מִפְּנֵי in v. 16, are circumstantial to מַעֲלִים in v. 15, to בָּא in v. 16, and to וַיָּבֹאוּ in v. 17, and describe David's activity as he ascends and arrives at his city.⁴⁵⁵ In general, vv. 14-17 focus on the ascent and arrival of the ark to the city of David, stressing David's participation and the fanfare of the arrival. The eyes and ears are stimulated by vivid descriptions of appearances and sounds.

5.1 Analysis

5.1.1 Yahweh's Response to David's Rejection: Blessing

This material prolongs or raises anew difficult or impossible-to-answer questions. Who is the Gittite Obed-edom and what is his בֵּית (cf. 4.1.3.6)? What and how did Yahweh bless? Why did Yahweh bless? By whom was the blessing reported to David and why? What part, if any, did the prophets Gad⁴⁵⁶ and Nathan⁴⁵⁷ have in reporting to David? It is noteworthy that Yahweh's blessing inspires the second attempt to transfer the ark (2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14; 2 Sam. 6.12a) and that the successful completion of the transfer is capped by David's blessing of the people and his move to bless his own בֵּית (2 Sam. 6.18, 20 // 1 Chron. 16.2, 43). Murray takes (the report of) Yahweh's blessing as the turning point in the plot (2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14; 2 Sam. 6.12a)⁴⁵⁸, but the story's climax rather lies in the entrance of the ark into the city of David and its deposit in its tent in 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1. Nevertheless, the fact that Yahweh's blessing prompts the successful transfer of the ark which in turn leads to David's blessing of Israel suggests that Yahweh's blessing forecasts a favourable outcome to the relocation.

⁴⁵⁵ Fokkelman 1990: 194 takes מְכַרְכֵּר in v. 14 as circumstantial to v. 13, but the repetition of מְכַרְכֵּר in v. 16 suggests that the verb should be construed with the ark's arrival rather than departure.

⁴⁵⁶ 1 Sam. 22.5; 2 Sam. 24.11, 13-14, 18-19.

⁴⁵⁷ 2 Sam. 7.2, 3, 4, 17; 12.1, 5, 7, 13, 15, 25.

⁴⁵⁸ Murray 1998: 131.

The meaning of יָשַׁב ('dwell, lodge, abide, continue, endure, remain, stay, tarry') and its representation by καθίζω are unremarkable except to say that the usage of the latter in Greek Chronicles may indicate that an original κατοικέω was revised to καθίζω on the basis of Greek Samuel. This is an inner-Greek issue and does not require further discussion here.⁴⁵⁹ Both MT versions have שְׁלֹשָׁה חֳדָשִׁים, as does LXX^B Chronicles with τρεῖς μῆνας, but Greek Samuel and LXX^L Chronicles have μῆνας τρεῖς, and LXX^A Chronicles has τρεῖς ἡμέρας.⁴⁶⁰ The period of 'three months' appears in seven biblical passages, including 2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14 and 2 Sam. 24.13 // 1 Chron. 21.12.⁴⁶¹ Two questions regarding this period are unanswerable. First, did three months elapse before Yahweh's blessing was discernible or reported or did David deliberately wait three months to reassure himself of the ark's or deity's beneficent character?⁴⁶² Second, how did Yahweh bless Obed-edom such that the blessing was evident after three months? What happened to Obed-edom, or perhaps what *did not* befall him (!) in this brief period of time? Murray suggests that 'three months' in Samuel echoes the ark's sojourn in Philistia for seven months (1 Sam. 6.1): three months in Ashdod, three months in Gath, and one month in Ekron⁴⁶³; but the time spent in each city is unspecified in 1 Samuel 5. The narrative function of Chronicles' 'three months' has a dual purpose. First, 1 Chron. 14.1-17 shows how in the interim David 'grew progressively greater' in the eyes of the neighbouring states: 'He too, like Obed-edom, is continuing to be blessed in all he

⁴⁵⁹ See Allen 1974: I, 181-182.

⁴⁶⁰ See appendix 3 on the numerical syntax, and also appendix 2 on the ark's epithet.

⁴⁶¹ Also: Gen. 38.24; Exod. 2.2 (שְׁלֹשָׁה יָרֵחַ); 2 Kgs. 23.31 // 2 Chron. 36.2; 2 Kgs. 24.8 // 2 Chron. 36.9; Amos 4.7.

⁴⁶² Caquot and de Robert 1994: 416.

⁴⁶³ Murray 1998: 130 n. 62.

does'.⁴⁶⁴ Second, many observe that (non-synoptic) 1 Chron. 15.1-24 makes clear that proper care of the ark is a levitical prerogative, such that the interim stimulated David's acquiescence to cultic regulations.

The accounts differ on the indirect object. First, MT Samuel has וַיֵּשֶׁב ... בֵּית, MT Chronicles has וַיֵּשֶׁב ... עַם-בֵּית, and the Greek translations have either καὶ ἐκάθισεν εἰς οἶκον (LXX^{AB} Samuel) or καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν (τῷ) οἴκῳ (LXX^L Samuel, Greek Chronicles). Second, the story in Samuel continues with הַגָּתִי but MT and LXX^L Chronicles (but not LXX^{AB} Chronicles) have both עַם-בֵּית עֶבֶד אֲדָם / ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ἀβεδδαδαν and בְּבֵיתוֹ / ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ. Regarding the first issue, the absence of a preposition in MT Samuel has elicited two responses: either ב was lost through haplography or בֵּית is an adverbial accusative. It is suggested in 4.1.3.6 that the absence of a preposition in MT Samuel's וַיִּשְׁתָּהוּ דוֹד בֵּית עֶבֶד-אֲדָם הַגָּתִי (as opposed to אל/εἰς preceding בֵּית/οἶκον in the other versions) is possibly original. The same could be true here but the state of affairs is not straightforward. The verb וַיִּשְׁתָּהוּ in 2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13 *requires* that the ark go *to* Obed-edom's בֵּית. However, the verb וַיֵּשֶׁב in 2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14 can be construed with adjuncts meaning 'at' but also 'beside' and 'in'. First, what is the בֵּית עֶבֶד אֲדָם: Obed-edom's house or the deity's house, i.e., a temple or a complex containing a temple?⁴⁶⁵ Second, where is the ark deposited? It is clearly 'at' Obed-edom's בֵּית, but was it kept inside or outside the בֵּית proper, perhaps in a tent or in another nearby edifice? Third, is MT Samuel's vague reading secondary (accidentally or intentionally) or are the other versions adjusted to eliminate this?

⁴⁶⁴ Johnstone 1997: I, 173.

⁴⁶⁵ Also see 3.1.2.3 on בֵּית אֲבִינֶדָב.

Static location ('where?') is normally expressed with ב or ל although an adverbial accusative of certain nouns can express 'place at which' or 'local determination'.⁴⁶⁶ For example, בית (without a preposition) is used with ישב, meaning 'dwell in a/the house', in Gen. 38.11; 2 Sam. 13.20; Isa. 44.13; Jer. 20.6; 36.22; Prov. 25.24; 2 Chron. 26.21. This evidence also sustains the point that Samuel's וישב ארון יהוה בית עבד אדם הגתִי means 'and the ark lodged in—not "at" or "beside"—the Gittite Obed-edom's 'בית'. It is also significant that בית is rendered ἐν (τῷ) οἴκῳ in the Greek translations of the aforementioned passages.⁴⁶⁷ The other constructions attested in 2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14 are summarised.⁴⁶⁸

- καθίζω + ἐν (LXX^L Samuel; LXX Chronicles) = ישב + ב. This construction is common in both Hebrew and Greek, occurs with בית (e.g., 2 Sam. 7.1, 2, 6), and consequently it is the *lectio facilior*.
- καθίζω + εἰς (LXX^{AB} Samuel) = ישב + ל/אל. ישב + אל occurs in 1 Kgs. 13.20 but elsewhere the construction is doubtful. ישב + ל occurs in Judg. 5.17 (LXX παρά); Ps. 9.5 and 132.12 (LXX ἐπὶ); and Prov 9.14 (LXX ἐπὶ). καθίζω + εἰς occurs elsewhere in Lam. 2.10 and interestingly in 1 Sam. 5.11, where it stands parallel to MT's ל + שוב.
- ישב + ע (MT Chronicles).⁴⁶⁹ The other valid example of this construction is Gen. 25.11; elsewhere the Hebrew and Greek examples express personal accompaniment (i.e., sit/remain *with* a person, donkey, baggage, etc.). ע may mean 'by, beside, alongside' but in many cases 'at' and 'near, close to' are equally viable interpretations.⁴⁷⁰

The most interesting versional reading is shared by MT and LXX^L Chronicles:

יְשַׁבְּ אֶת־בֵּית עַבְדֵּי אֲדָם בְּבֵיתוֹ / ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Αβεδδαδαν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ. The preposition ע is generally represented by μέτα or παρά in the Greek version, but on occasion ἐν (the

⁴⁶⁶ GKC §118d-h, pp. 373-374; JM §125n, p. 449; §126h, pp. 458-459; WO §10.2.2b, pp. 169-171; A. B. Davidson 1901: §69, pp. 98-99; Williams 1976: §54, p. 12. JM §126h, p. 458 points out that 'In Aramaic [בית] is often used in the local accusative'. See appendix 3.

⁴⁶⁷ Prov. 25.24 has ἐν οἴκῳ.

⁴⁶⁸ A thorough presentation of the evidence is unreasonable. The comments here focus on ישב with different prepositions rather than the latter with בית, although the writer has thoroughly investigated both.

⁴⁶⁹ Would καθίζω + μέτα equal ישב + ע? καθίζω never occurs with παρά or σύν in biblical Greek. Or is ἐν the original translation?

⁴⁷⁰ BDB 768.

workhorse of Greek prepositions) evidently stands for עַם⁴⁷¹, as in Gen. 35.4 and 1 Chron. 21.15, where עַם is used for locality. Curtis and Madsen, followed by others, think

the ark was in its tent alongside or near the house of Obed-edom. This statement is a modification of that of 2 S. 6¹¹ ... where the ark is represented as placed *in* the house of Obed-edom. The Chronicler, however, evidently could not conceive of the ark placed in an ordinary dwelling and modified the text accordingly.⁴⁷²

This view must be rejected for the following reasons: (1) The noun בֵּית may refer to a family home or a king's or god's home (i.e., a palace or temple) so that the Chronicler did not necessarily understand בֵּית as an 'ordinary dwelling'. Furthermore, if the Chronicler was so concerned to have the ark in the proper place he could have supplied אֹהֶל, as in 1 Chron. 15.1; 16.1 (// 2 Sam. 6.17); 2 Chron. 1.4; 5.5 (// 1 Kgs. 8.4). (2) If the ark was not in Obed-edom's בֵּית (whatever it is) then why did Yahweh bless it in 1 Chron. 13.14, and why did David and Israel bring up the ark after three months from it (2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25)? (3) Fokkelman remarks that 'the house of Abinadab (the father of Uzzah) fulfilled ... the same function (as emergency accommodation for attending to the ark after a terrible blow from God) which the house of Obed Edom has here ...'⁴⁷³ Japhet, among others, discards Curtis' and Madsen's view, thinking Chronicles' בבֵּיתוֹ functions to place 'the greater emphasis on "in his house"'; but why the emphasis? Nevertheless, she is right to discount the idea that Chronicles wishes to avoid הַגִּתִּי, since Obed-edom was already labelled a Gittite. Finally, although Samuel's הַגִּתִּי and Chronicles' בבֵּיתוֹ are far from wholly different in appearance, Chronicles' בבֵּיתוֹ does not seem to be either an intentional or unintentional variant of הַגִּתִּי.

⁴⁷¹ Hatch and Redpath 1897: II, 174-174; Johannessohn 1925: 324-336; Muraoka 1998: 111. On the other hand, based on the usage of καθίζω, the occurrence of ἐν, and the spelling of Obed-edom's name, Greek Chronicles may reflect dependence on Samuel, but this seems less than likely for the preposition ἐν. See Allen 1974: I, 181-182, 191-192 for discussion.

⁴⁷² Curtis and Madsen 1910: 206.

⁴⁷³ Fokkelman 1990: 193.

Textual variation in the versions suggests that editorial activity has fundamentally altered the original account, which was probably not simply בית or בבית meaning 'in the house' (the *lectio facillior*). An explanation which has not been suggested until now is that ביתו אדם עבד // εὐ τῷ οἴκῳ Αβεδδαδαν εὐ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ is a double reading in which an original עם-statement is revised to בביתו in MT Chronicles, followed by the Lucianic recension: 'the ark lodged "in proximity" to Obed-edom's בית, in his בית'. The exact nuance of עם is difficult to pinpoint. It could mean 'at' or 'by, beside, alongside' or 'near, close to'. One reasonably concludes, however, that עם-בית should not be construed as בבית. The notion that the ark was housed 'at' (עם/ל) Obed-edom's בית was transformed to say that it was housed 'in' (ב) it. The original thought remains in the first member of MT Chronicles' doublet and in LXX^{AB} Samuel which is also the OG translation.⁴⁷⁴ In summary, the story was revised to בית(ב) and glossed by הגתי in MT Samuel, and it was adjusted by the insertion of בביתו in MT Chronicles. This change's motivation may be to properly house the ark *in* the 'cultic' בית.

5.1.1.2 2 Sam. 6.11
1 Chron. 13.14

ויברך יהוה את־עבד אדם ואת־כל־ביתו //
ויברך יהוה את־בית עבד־אדם ואת־כל־אשר־לו

The object of Yahweh's blessing is expressed in two phrases, the first referring to 'Obed-edom' or '(all) Obed-edom's בית' and the second referring to 'all his בית' or 'all his belongings'. Regarding the second clause, an earlier ואת־כל־אשר־לו / καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ was revised to ואת־כל־ביתו in MT Samuel's tradition, and this revision is reflected also in LXX^A Samuel's καὶ ὅλον τὸν οἶκον. Some think the second clause in Greek Samuel *and in Chronicles* was adjusted toward 2 Sam. 6.12a's ואת־כל־אשר־לו אדם. This is improbable since 2 Sam. 6.12a is a plus, and its first half is not reflected uniformly in the

⁴⁷⁴ Nysse 1984: 449 implies the final point.

allegedly revised texts. MT and LXX^A Samuel are the exceptions to consistent language in all other accounts. Regarding the first clause, the relationship of the witnesses is complex. Again, LXX^A Samuel probably reflects revision toward the received text. The discrepancy in the location of בית in Samuel, and its occurrence in MT and LXX^L Chronicles, but its non-appearance in LXX^{AB} Chronicles, suggest that the presence or absence of *this word* was the focus of the revisionary process. Beyond this, the data precludes a definitive answer.⁴⁷⁵ Except for possible parablepsis related to *taw* in an original אַת בית in Chronicles, there is no apparent motive for the absence of the noun in LXX^{AB} Chronicles.

In spite of the fact that בית occurs nearly twice as often in Kings (344 times) and Chronicles (330 times) as in Samuel (176 times), the noun occurs more often in 1 Samuel 31; 2 Samuel 5–8, 23 (33 times) than in 1 Chronicles 10–18 (29 times). On twenty-three occasions Samuel and Chronicles agree on בית.⁴⁷⁶ Chronicles has בית in non-synoptic material in 1 Chron. 12.29–31; 15.1 (four times), and Samuel has it in 2 Sam. 5.8; 6.3, 12, 21; 7.29; 23.5 (six times). In synoptic material Samuel but not Chronicles has בית in 1 Sam. 31.9 // 1 Chron. 10.9; 2 Sam. 5.9 // 1 Chron. 11.8; 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8; and 2 Sam. 6.15 // 1 Chron. 15.28. The reverse is true in 1 Sam. 31.6 // 1 Chron. 10.6⁴⁷⁷ and 2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14, but it is suggested in 5.1.1.1 for the second set of passages

⁴⁷⁵ See the discussion in Nysse 1984: 381, 474. He thinks three Hebrew textforms are attested.

⁴⁷⁶ Once in 1 Samuel 31 // 1 Chronicles 10; once in 2 Samuel 5 // 1 Chronicles 14; seven times in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16; and fourteen times in 2 Samuel 7 // 1 Chronicles 17.

⁴⁷⁷ Here Chronicles says Saul's entire בית perished whereas Samuel refers to 'Saul and his three sons and his armour-bearer and all his men'. Nine reasons (!) underlie the alteration in Samuel: Saul's son Ishbaal (2 Samuel 2–4); Saul's sons Armoni and Mephibosheth by Rizpah (2 Samuel 21); Saul's five grandsons by Merab (2 Samuel 21); and Jonathan's son Mephibosheth (2 Samuel 4, 9, 16, 19, 21). Samuel's revisers were forced to alter the original reading since otherwise David could not have received a positive response to his question in 2 Sam. 9.1, and Samuel's story of protracted warfare between the houses of David and Saul would have faced literary obstacles as well. Auld 2003: 242 says: 'In the Book of Two Houses, in this case faithfully preserved in 1 Chronicles 10, Saul, like Elhanan and Goliath, had simply a walk-on part: he was killed, 'and his three sons, and his whole house together' (10:6). But the authors of Samuel first build him into a major tragic character and then prolong the death agonies of his house'. See Ho 1995: 85–87.

that Chronicles' בביתו is an alternative reading for the preceding phrase עַם־בֵּית עֶבֶד אֲדָם. In light of these statistics, the frequency and variations in these chapters with respect to בית suggest that Samuel has a somewhat greater interest in this notion than does Chronicles. It is pointed out in the discussion of בית ישראל in 3.1.3.4 that בית plays a key role in Samuel. The evidence suggests (see below) that Yahweh's blessing of Obed-edom's בית is a 'disguised' blessing upon David and his בית (to the detriment of Saul and his בית).

'Blessing' is important in this story, and in Samuel and Chronicles in general, which follow only Psalms, Genesis and Deuteronomy in frequency of usage of בָּרַךְ.⁴⁷⁸ Blessing makes its first appearance in 2 Sam. 6.11-12 // 1 Chron. 13.14, where Yahweh blesses Obed-edom (or his בית or belongings—see above) and then David blesses the people (6.18 // 16.2) and goes to bless his own בית (6.20 // 16.43). The issues here are the significance and shape of Yahweh's blessing. Normally Yahweh or Yahweh God blesses, and rarely God.⁴⁷⁹ In Samuel and Chronicles the deity is blessed more frequently than he blesses. One person may (potentially or actually) bless something or somebody, and Yahweh may be blessed or his blessing wished upon another, but the deity explicitly blesses only three times: He blesses Israel's people in 2 Chron. 31.10, Jabez in 1 Chron. 4.10, and Obed-edom in 2 Sam. 6.11-12; 1 Chron. 13.14; 26.5. Also, David requests Yahweh's blessing in 2 Sam. 7.29 // 1 Chron. 17.27, and the realisation of his petition seems more than certain since Yahweh explicitly promises the content of the requested blessing ('an eternal house') in 2 Sam. 7.5-16 // 1 Chron. 17.4-14.⁴⁸⁰ Just as Yahweh fulfilled his promise to deliver David from his enemies (compare, e.g., 2 Sam. 3.18 and 2 Sam. 5.20; 7.1, 9, 11) so also does he pledge a Davidic dynasty.

⁴⁷⁸ See appendix 2 on the variation in the reference to the deity in Hebrew and Greek Chronicles.

⁴⁷⁹ See Greek Chronicles and appendix 2.

⁴⁸⁰ Compare Polzin 1993: 65-66.

McKane and Murray remark on the irony in Yahweh's blessing of a Gittite given the consequences of the ark's presence among the Philistines (Gittites et al.) in the earlier ark narrative.⁴⁸¹ Indeed, only here does the deity bless *anyone or anything* in the ark's presence. (Canonically) earlier legal stipulations stress the proper care and transport of the ark by Levites and its separation from the people in the sanctuary and/or behind/under a curtain or screen. Positively, the ark embodies Yahweh's presence, guidance and gift of victory in warfare, but on a personal level the ark also lives up to its 'standoffish' reputation by bringing terror in battle, plague and destruction, and sudden death. The ark is charged with (*by?*) a vicious force.⁴⁸²

The dissimilar consequences of the ark's Philistine interludes summon to mind David's own experiences among the Philistines. If Israel's experiences with her archenemy were mostly negative, or at best a mixed state of affairs (especially under Saul), David had a positive experience under Philistine patronage, and he brought about a change of fortune for Israel as well, including the ark's recovery. Samuel even records the personal names of some Philistines, and in each case they function to authenticate David's political, social, and military achievements: patronage under Achish, loyalty and service from Ittai and Obed-edom, and victory (by David or his soldiers) over the Philistine giants Goliath, Ishbi-benob, Lahmi, and Saph.⁴⁸³

The deity's blessing of Obed-edom and his house (in some versions—see above) provokes other potential ironies and connections. בֵּית only occasionally has בית as its object.⁴⁸⁴ The referents are the houses of an Egyptian (Gen. 39.5), a Philistine, David (twice), and the nation Israel (Ps. 115.12), and the subject in each case is the deity, except

⁴⁸¹ McKane 1963: 208; Murray 1998: 130 n. 62. Compare 2 Sam. 6.10-11 with 1 Sam. 5.8-9.

⁴⁸² Steussy 1999: 60.

⁴⁸³ Delilah is the only other named Philistine in the Bible.

⁴⁸⁴ Polzin 1993: 219 n. 6 overstates the facts saying 'It is not hard to find the LORD blessing all kinds of houses *outside* the History ...'

in 2 Sam. 6.20 // 1 Chron. 16.43, where it is David.⁴⁸⁵ The parallel between Yahweh's blessing of the Egyptian officer Potiphar on account of Joseph, a גר in Egypt, and his similar blessing of the Philistine guardian of the ark, Obed-edom, a גר in Israel, is intriguing. Is this blessing on account of or for the benefit of David? The messenger's and David's responses indicate that at least *they* believe the answer is affirmative. Alternatively, Murray says '... the blessing of Obed Edom's household "on account of the ark" was a sign, not that Yahweh was now happy for David to remove the ark from there to David's city, but rather that he approved of its present lodgement'⁴⁸⁶, but Murray's explanation is dependent on reading behind the text rather than reading the text itself, which construes the blessing as a sign in David's favour, and eventually in Israel's favour too, since the populace also receives David's blessing.

Yahweh's infrequent blessing in Samuel and Chronicles is sketched above. In addition, elsewhere in the Former Prophets Yahweh blesses only Israel as a people (Josh. 17.14) and the boy Samson (Judg. 13.24). *The very fact that Yahweh blesses at all in the story of the ark's transfer is significant.* Indeed, Yahweh's blessing is the go-ahead for David to continue the ark's transfer, a sign that no further harm will come to him or others, and ultimately a 'disguised' blessing of David himself. In the Former Prophets Yahweh struggles or refuses to give his blessing, and perhaps for this reason the blessing on David is portrayed as a blessing on Obed-edom, a figure who never reappears in biblical literature aside from Chronicles' superfluities. Finally, it may be argued that David successfully elicited Yahweh's blessing by refusing to bring the ark to Jerusalem following Uzzah's slaughter.⁴⁸⁷ The text emphasises David's reprimanding; the ark emits

⁴⁸⁵ ברכה is applied to the 'house' of Israel (Ezek. 44.30).

⁴⁸⁶ Murray 1998: 132-133.

⁴⁸⁷ Gelandner 1991: 42-46.

messages of reconciliation and appeasement. The focus falls on David's initiative, control and victory.

Speculation on the content of the deity's blessing of Obed-edom includes descendants, riches, livestock, crops, goodness, and others, but what if any of this would become visible after three months? Caquot and de Robert speak of 'un charme de fécondité attaché à l'arche'.⁴⁸⁸ According to 1 Chron. 26.4-8 Obed-edom had 62 descendants, including 8 sons, and 1 Chron. 26.5 must certainly allude to 1 Chron. 13.14. According to post-biblical legend, the women in Obed-edom's house gave birth after a pregnancy of two months only, and bore six children at one time, and Solomon's temple began to bud cedars and cypresses and to bear fruit when the ark was transferred there.⁴⁸⁹ In the end, however, the shape of the blessing of Obed-edom is disregarded.⁴⁹⁰ The focus of the blessing is David and his enterprise—not the ark's provisional attendant.

5.1.1.3 2 Sam. 6.12 ויגד למלך דוד לאמר ברך יהוה את־בית עבד אדם ואת־כל־אשר־לו
בעבור ארון האלהים

Samuel's plus is attested uniformly (except for LXX^L with ἀπήγγειλαν versus LXX^{AB}'s ἀπηγγέλη⁴⁹¹). In addition, LXX^L and the OL append additional material. The content of the messenger's report in v. 12a repeats the narrator's statement in v. 11b, but as noted above the wording in v. 12a, ואת־בית עבד אדם ואת־כל־אשר־לו / τὸν οἶκον Αβεδδαρά καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ, agrees with the wording in v. 11a of LXX^{BL} and also with MT and LXX^L 1 Chron. 13.14. The query here concerns the authenticity of the plus: was it in Chronicles' *Vorlage*? Observe that the material in 2 Sam. 6.11-12 is separated in

⁴⁸⁸ Caquot and de Robert 1994: 416.

⁴⁸⁹ Ginzberg 1928: 275; Patai 1947: 90-91.

⁴⁹⁰ Alternatively (as asked earlier) did Yahweh bless Obed-edom by *not causing anything to befall him* during the ark's three months stay in his בית?

⁴⁹¹ Hp נגד in usually represented by ἀπηγγέλη in LXX^{AB} of Samuel-Kings, whereas LXX^L prefers ἀπήγγειλαν.

Chronicles by 1 Chron. 14.1-17 (// 2 Sam. 5.11-25) and Chronicles' own plus in 1 Chron.

15.1-24:

2 Sam. 6.11	//	1 Chron. 13.14
ø	//	1 Chron. 14.1-15.24
2 Sam. 6.12a	//	ø
2 Sam. 6.12b	//	1 Chron. 15.25

1 Chron. 15.1-24 recounts David's preparations for the ark's transport from Obed-edom's בית: he prepares a 'place' and a 'tent' for the ark (v. 1), and he appoints levitical carriers (vv. 2-15) and musicians (vv. 16-24). Some suggest that following the lengthy composition in 1 Chron. 15.1-24 the Chronicler accidentally omitted the report found in 2 Sam. 6.12a when he returned to his *Vorlage*.⁴⁹² Some believe the Chronicler's omission was intentional but not tendentious, since in their view the minus in Chronicles is understandable following the lengthy span created by the insertion of 1 Chron. 14.1-15.24.⁴⁹³ Most think the Chronicler tendentiously omitted the report in his *Vorlage* since David carefully planned the ark's return to Jerusalem. The Chronicler avoided portraying David as an opportunist.⁴⁹⁴ On one hand, the frequent suggestion that David's response to the report in 2 Sam. 6.12a portrays him as an opportunist is baseless. Even if the report was in Chronicles' *Vorlage*, the Chronicler 'could equally well have taken it as evidence of David's piety, to sincerely desire the blessing of God' rather than as an unseemly incentive for fetching the ark.⁴⁹⁵ On the other hand, scholars overlook the significant role of נגד in Samuel which may enlighten the insertion of the plus.⁴⁹⁶ This verb occurs 370

⁴⁹² E.g., Lemke 1963: 35-36; McKenzie 1984: 62; Rehm 1937: 52.

⁴⁹³ E.g., Braun 1986: 191; Stoebe 1994: 195; Willi 1972: 147.

⁴⁹⁴ E.g., Rothstein and Hänel 1927: 300; Rudolph 1955: 115; Williamson 1982: 119-120.

⁴⁹⁵ Lemke 1963: 36 n. 42; cf. 35-36; cf. McKenzie 1984: 62. The comment in Murray 1998: 61 on the LXX^L and OL plus is also pertinent here. It is unlikely that ancient editors would have perceived David's motivation in this way given that David's action brings a general blessing to all the people. Josephus saw nothing objectionable in David's conduct (*Jewish Antiquities* 7.84).

⁴⁹⁶ Campbell 1975: 137 suggests that 'the impersonal passive construction throws the emphasis on to the reappearance of David in the narrative'. Both the H *wayyiqtol* 3mp (וַיֵּרָא; nine times) and the Hp *wayyiqtol* 3ms (וַיֵּרָא; eight times) function impersonally in Samuel to introduce a report. It is not obvious that the

times, 335 times in the H stem ('make known, disclose, declare, report') and 35 times in the Hp stem, and most often in Samuel, which has 89 occurrences (24%) in 33 (of 55) chapters, followed by Kings (37 times), Genesis (36 times), Isaiah (32 times), Judges (28 times), Jeremiah (28 times), and Psalms (20 times). Chronicles has a mere eight instances of this verb, seven of which are shared with Samuel–Kings. 2 Chron. 20.2 has the only non-shared occurrence. Aside from the current passage, Chronicles lacks an occurrence in a shared passage only in 2 Sam. 24.13 // 1 Chron. 21.11, where Samuel may very well have a doublet in which an original אָמַר is supplemented by (the superfluous) נָגַד, but this must be argued elsewhere. In Samuel the verb frequently serves for a messenger's report, often in the context of a reconnaissance mission or military operation, and especially in material dealing with Saul versus David and Absalom versus David. However, נָגַד also has a prophetic facet in Samuel; from a theological perspective the verb נָגַד is used primarily in prophetic and cultic texts.⁴⁹⁷ Samuel's bias for נָגַד, Chronicles' consistent replication of the verb in synoptic material in spite of its non-appearance elsewhere, the possible doublet in Samuel in 2 Sam. 24.13 // 1 Chron. 21.11, and the verb's prophetic connections in Samuel, suggest that the נָגַד-clause was inserted into Samuel. This should be considered in light of Gelandner's argument that Yahweh's 'ark emitted messages of reconciliation and appeasement', as if reaching out to David to continue the transfer. After all, is there a better reason for carrying on than a prophetic message from the deity that he had blessed the attendant rather than slay him too? It is equally if not more likely that

absence of an explicit personal subject for נָגַד serves to highlight another figure in the context, in this case David, as if subtraction from one side of the balance (i.e., the messenger) causes the other to weigh heavier (i.e., David). The impersonal construction likely represents ordinary idiom, but it still causes us to wonder who mediated the report and why.

⁴⁹⁷ García López 1998: 177-182.

Samuel encourages (by supplementation) a cautious or fearful David than that Chronicles eliminates (by deletion) an opportunistic one.⁴⁹⁸

This is the first time 'king' has been used as a title for David since 2 Sam. 5.17, and the designation appears twice more in 2 Samuel 6: 'King David' in v. 16 and 'the king of Israel' in v. 20.⁴⁹⁹ Otherwise, 'David' is used seventeen times and the 'city of David' three times (vv. 10, 12, 16) in 2 Samuel 6. Chronicles' ark story has the word 'king' for David only in 1 Chron. 15.29 (// 2 Sam. 6.16).⁵⁰⁰ Murray says 'Thus it is pointedly in his persona as *melek* that David responds to the news of the blessing brought by the ark to the household of Obed Edom'.⁵⁰¹ Campbell says 'It is a pointer which already in this introduction to the second expedition augurs well for its success'.⁵⁰² Should 'king' be construed as a commentary on David's person, as a foreshadowing of the outcome of the ark's transfer, both or neither? 'King' here and twice in the Michal material is significant. It may be suggested that a shared reference to David's kingship in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 is extended into Samuel's pluses in 2 Sam. 6.12, 20, and that the triple reference to David's kingship highlights his status vis-à-vis Saul, who is the father of Michal and also the former 'king'. According to Samuel, as soon as Saul's kingship begins (1 Sam. 15.1; למלך ... שאול), his disobedience (vv. 2-9) causes Yahweh to regret the decision to make him ruler (vv. 10-11; שאול למלך). The first occurrence of the phrase שאול המלך occurs when the women of Israel come out to meet 'King Saul' (18.6) while paradoxically singing the pro-David refrain 'Saul has killed his thousands, and David his ten thousands' (v. 7). In fact, שאול המלך comes in an MT plus, in the form of the supposedly late phrase

⁴⁹⁸ It is relevant that Murray 1998: 131-132 argues that 'v. 12a is a rhetorically heightened repetition of v. 11b'.

⁴⁹⁹ See appendix 3 on the grammar of למלך דוד.

⁵⁰⁰ A generic reference to 'kings' appears in 1 Chron. 16.21.

⁵⁰¹ Murray 1998: 132 n. 67.

⁵⁰² Campbell 1975: 137.

⁵⁰³ X המלך' and is the only time in the Bible that Saul is called 'King Saul'. Ironically, the first reference to David's kingship (דוד מלך הארץ) in 1 Sam. 21.12 is connected with the repetition of the same pro-David refrain. Elsewhere in Samuel '(the) king' is used with reference to Saul, but the final reference to Saul's kingship comes in 1 Sam. 29.3 (שאול מלך־ישראל), which once again is connected with the repetition of the same pro-David refrain (v. 5).⁵⁰⁴ Throughout Samuel Saul's 'kingship' is slighted in favour of David's, and in the present context, and again in v. 16, המלך דוד implicitly says what Michal, the daughter of Saul, is soon to explicitly recognise herself (v. 20).

See 5.1.1.2 on the shape and content of the messenger's report (ברך יהוה את־בית עבד). An additional element here is the causal statement בעבור ארון (אדם ואת־כל־אשר־לו). The preposition בעבור expresses either causality ('because of, on account of, on behalf of, for the sake of'; 31 times, including 10 in Samuel and 9 in Genesis) or finality ('so that, in order that'; 18 times, including 6 in Genesis and 5 in Samuel). According to J. A. Swanson the causal usage of בעבור encompasses two semantically related nuances: it is either (1) a marker of the reason for an event ('because of, on account of') or (2) a marker of the participant that is benefited by an event ('on behalf of, for the sake of').⁵⁰⁶ The object of בעבור is usually a person or group of people (21 times), but may also be an abstract concept (6 times) or an inanimate object (4 times). Does בעבור האלהים express the *reason* that Yahweh blessed Obed-edom ('because/on account of the ark') or the participant that is *benefited* by his blessing ('on behalf/for the sake of the ark')? The idea of the second option is that Yahweh blessed Obed-edom for the sake of the ark, so that David would return and take this significant object to its proper place.

⁵⁰³ See appendix 3.

⁵⁰⁴ It is remarkable that in the first account the women alone sing 'Saul has killed his thousands, and David his ten thousands' (1 Sam. 18.6-7), but in the subsequent reports (1 Sam. 21.12; 29.5) the verb is 'they sang' (יענו), which blurs the gender and extent of the group of singers.

⁵⁰⁵ See appendix 2 on the ark's epithet.

⁵⁰⁶ J. A. Swanson 1997: electronic edition.

At this point, LXX^L and the OL have additional material which is attested in three forms. The hypothetical Hebrew *Vorlagen* are:

את הברכה אל ביתי	אשיב	וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד ⁵⁰⁷
עם הברכה אל ביתי	ואשיב את הארון	וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד ⁵⁰⁸
ואת הברכה אל ביתי	ארון האלהים ואת	וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד ⁵⁰⁹

Most consider the plus an unoriginal expansion. However, McCarter and Murray think the plus is original, but accidentally omitted by haplography due to homoioarcton (וַיֹּאמֶר וַיֵּלֶךְ דָּוִד אֲשִׁיב אֶת הַבְּרָכָה אֶל בֵּיתִי וְיָלֵךְ).⁵¹⁰ H. P. Smith believes the plus is original, but purposefully omitted 'on account of its frank egoism'.⁵¹¹ The following points disfavour the originality of the plus: (1) The plus does contribute to the structure, form, and content of the story, as some argue, but it is methodologically erroneous to equate suitability with originality. Primary and secondary hands are both capable of (re-)writing biblical stories. (2) The evidence for the plus is early and strong, thus its antiquity may be affirmed, but no trace of it exists in the Hebrew traditions. (3) The plus is the fullest of three distinct forms of the 2 Sam. 6.11b-12a narrative, and all things considered, and barring unintentional error, scribes and editors usually add rather than subtract. (4) The plus is attested with three different wordings and this is evidence of scribal activity in the ongoing composition of the plus.

⁵⁰⁷ LXX mss 82 (o), 93 (e₂), 108 (b), 127 (c₂), 158 (g), 554 (z) = LXX^L: καὶ εἶπε Δαυὶδ ἐπιστρέψω τὴν εὐλογίαν εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου; Vercellone, Cod. Leg. Goth., L₉₁₋₉₅ (OL marginal notes in Spanish Vulgate Bibles): *et dixit david revocabo benedictionem in domum meam*.

⁵⁰⁸ Sabatier, Cod. Germ. no. 7: *dixitque daueid ibo et reducam arcam cum benedictione in domum meam*.

⁵⁰⁹ LXX ms 19 (b'): καὶ εἶπε Δαυὶδ ἐπιστρέψω τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου.

⁵¹⁰ McCarter 1984: 165-166; Murray 1998: 61, 132-133. In Greek, haplography due to homoioteleuton is also possible: θεοῦ καὶ ... μου καὶ.

⁵¹¹ H. P. Smith 1899: 295-296.

5.1.2 David's Response to Yahweh's Blessing: The Successful Removal of the Ark to Jerusalem

The discussion in this section focuses on David's realisation of the ark's transfer whereas the next section looks at the circumstances accompanying this event. The chief elements in 2 Sam. 6.12b, 15a, 17a, 19b-20a // 1 Chron. 15.25a, 28a, 16.1a, 43a are the subjects of the activities, the verbs of moving and placing, the ark and its epithets, and the locations involved. With respect to verb usage the successful completion of David's mission is narrated by הלך (2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25), עלה (2 Sam. 6.12, 15 // 1 Chron. 15.25, 28), צעד (2 Sam. 6.13), בוא (2 Sam. 6.16, 17 // 1 Chron. 15.29; 16.1) and especially יצג (2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1).⁵¹² This vocabulary and its repetition conclusively 'carry out' the earlier *endeavour* to retrieve the ark. The arrival of the ark in the city of David and its positioning '(in its place) inside the tent' (2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1) constitute the high point of the story.

5.1.2.1	2 Sam. 6.12	וילך דוד ויעל את־אֶרֶן הָאֱלֹהִים מִבַּיִת עֲבָד אֶדָם עִיר דָּוִד //
	1 Chron. 15.25	וַיְהִי דָוִד וְזָקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְשָׂרֵי הָאֲלָפִים הַחֲלָכִים לַהֲעֵלוֹת אֶת־אֶרֶן בְּרִית־יְהוָה מִן־בַּיִת עֲבָד־אֶדָם

Chronicles expands the shared subject 'David' by incorporating both זקני ישראל and שרי האלפים, thus transforming the focus on David as the chief performer into an act carried out by him and many others. It is widely recognised that Chronicles' focus on 'all Israel' is one of the book's characteristic traits: unanimity and unity, consultation and collaboration, between the king and the people, in important matters affecting national and cultic life. However, one must use cautiously the word '*Tendenz*' as a label for Chronicles' plus.⁵¹³

⁵¹² The narration of the abortive effort to transfer the ark makes use of the verbs קום (2 Sam. 6.2), הלך (2 Sam. 6.2), עלה (2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6 [twice]), רכב (2 Sam. 6.3 // 1 Chron. 13.7), נשא (2 Sam. 6.3-4) and בוא (2 Sam. 6.6, 9 // 1 Chron. 13.9, 12). The story's progress is brought to a standstill by the verbs (לא) סור (2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13), נטה (2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13), and especially ישב (2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14).

⁵¹³ See appendix 1.

Also observe that Samuel includes the participation of others. David clearly has the leading role in the procession, but 2 Sam. 6.13 has נשאים, 2 Sam. 6.15 has כל־בית ישראל, and the verbs ויצגו ... ויבאו in 2 Sam. 6.17 imply a plurality of participants.

The starting point of the ark's transfer is Obed-edom's בית and its goal is 'the city of David', but in this synoptic verse only Samuel explicitly states the latter.⁵¹⁴ The instances of עיר דו(י)ד are summarised in 4.1.3.5. 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles share the phrase on four occasions. Samuel has a plus in *synoptic* 2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25 and Chronicles uses it in *non-synoptic* 1 Chron. 15.1. The facts that 'the city of David' is a *Leitmotiv* in 2 Samuel 5–6 // 1 Chronicles 11, 13–16 and that Chronicles has the phrase more than any other book suggest that עיר דוד was inserted secondarily into 2 Sam. 6.12. The ark's epithet is האלהים in 2 Sam. 6.12 and ברית־יהוה in 1 Chron. 15.25, and both are probably secondary to an earlier יהוה ארון.⁵¹⁵

Contrary to most commentators and modern English translations Chronicles' והלכים ... יהי cannot be a periphrastic construction due to the definite article preceding the participle and to the disparity in grammatical number, i.e., יהיו rather than יהי would be required. יהי is introductory⁵¹⁶ and the verse as it stands must be rendered 'And it was/happened (that) David and the elders of Israel and the chiefs of the thousands (were) "the goers" to bring up the ark of the covenant of Yahweh from Obed-edom's בית'. Some scholars emend the text by deleting an allegedly dittographic *he* from והלכים, but this emendation is unnecessary⁵¹⁷, and it also creates an incongruence in the sequence of activity, i.e., an inept ellipsis in narrative sequence. Chronicles' expansion of the subject accentuates David's collaborators and the grammar anticipates the vivid portrayal of activity in 1 Chron. 15.26–28 (// 2 Sam. 6.13–15). Conversely, the action in Samuel's

⁵¹⁴ On מן־בית versus מבית see appendix 3.

⁵¹⁵ See appendix 2.

⁵¹⁶ See appendix 3.

⁵¹⁷ Kropat 1909: 13; cf. the discussion of 1 Chron. 15.26 in 5.1.3.3.

מבית עבד is perfective and bounded (due to the limit or terminus expressed in מלך ... וילך) and thus portrays the ark's transfer as *completed*. ויעל is proleptic. From the very start Samuel's grammar draws attention to the certainty of the end result.⁵¹⁸

5.1.2.2 2 Sam. 6.15
1 Chron. 15.28

ודוד וכל־בית ישראל מעלים את־ארון יהוה //
וכל־ישראל מעלים את־ארון ברית־יהוה

Some think the absence of ודוד in 1 Chron. 15.28 is due to haplography, following the ד of בד in 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27, but most think the Chronicler eliminated both דוד and בית as part of a pan-Israelite *Tendenz*. 'And David' is reflected in all versions of Samuel and in the Peshitta of Chronicles. 'The house' is present in Samuel (including apparently 4QSam^a based on space considerations) and absent from Chronicles with the following exceptions: the noun is present in the Peshitta of Chronicles but it is absent from the Peshitta, Lucianic and Jacob versions of Samuel, and it is also lacking in three medieval Hebrew manuscripts.⁵¹⁹ McCarter and McKenzie believe (mostly on the basis of LXX^L) that כל־ישראל is original in Samuel, to which they think the name 'David' was added secondarily.⁵²⁰ The discussion in 3.1.3.4 of 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 supports their first point. It is suggested further that both MT 2 Sam. 6.5 and MT 2 Sam. 6.15 are revised to correspond in terminology (as they do in subject matter, to a degree).⁵²¹

The participle מעלים is reflected in all witnesses to Samuel and Chronicles (including the imperfect verb forms in the Latin versions) except for Greek Samuel, which has either ἀνηγαγον (LXX^{BL} = הָעֵלָה [?]) or ἀνηγαγευ (LXX^A and mss ex = הָעֵלָה

⁵¹⁸ Campbell 1975: 137; Fokkelman 1990: 194.

⁵¹⁹ De Rossi 1785: II, 169.

⁵²⁰ McCarter 1984: 166; McKenzie 1984: 51-52. Nysse 1984: 236 is cautious about labelling the plus in LXX^B (and LXX^A) a revision toward MT Samuel. He is unsure whether LXX^B or LXX^L reflects the OG. The plus in LXX^B could easily occur independently or the minus in LXX^L could be due to haplography.

⁵²¹ See appendix 1. Campbell and O'Brien 2000: 289 reiterate the view, held *formerly* by most, that 'The status of 6:5, 15 as later additions is probable but not demonstrable (cf. Psalm 150)'. It may rather be that only specific aspects of these two verses are 'later'. See 5.1.3.2.

[?]). These variants together with the Greek translators' consistency in rendering predicative participles in this passage⁵²² suggest that a *qatal* verb form, probably העלו, stood in Greek Samuel's *Vorlage*. If so, the revised reading contributes 'to give the reader a[n even more] vivid impression of the scene'.⁵²³ In both versions, מעלים functions grammatically to refer to attendant circumstance at an arrival. The pragmatic effect of the participles in these verses is to vivify the scene. In any case, this occurrence of the *Leitwort* עלה⁵²⁴ in 2 Sam. 6.15 // 1 Chron. 15.28 is the grammatical realisation of the proleptic statement in 2 Sam. 6.12 (// 1 Chron. 15.25) and the fulfilment of David's original intention in 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6. David, his entourage, and Yahweh's ark and its transporters finally come up the south-eastern hill of Jerusalem to the city of David.⁵²⁵

5.1.2.3 2 Sam. 6.17 // ויבאו את־ארון יהוה ויצגו אתו במקומו בתוך האהל אשר נשחלו דוד
 1 Chron. 16.1 ויביאו את־ארון האלהים ויצגו אתו בתוך האהל אשר נשחלו דוד

The climax of the ark story lies in the entrance (בוא) of the ark into the city of David and its deposit (יצג) '(in its place) inside the tent' in 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1. These acts fulfil the literary intent and objective of the story of David's ark transfer.

⁵²² Except for this verse, all predicative participles in 2 Samuel 6 are rendered by imperfect or participle verb forms: נהגים/הִנְיָחוּ (v. 3), סוֹפְרוֹת/מְסַפְּרוֹת (v. 4), מְשַׁחֲקִים/παίζοντες (v. 5), מְכַרְכְּרִים/ἀνεκρούετο (v. 14), מְעַלִּים/ἀνέγαγον (v. 15), בָּא/παραγινόμενης (v. 16), נִשְׁקָפָה/διέκτυπεν (v. 16), מְפַחֵם/ὀρχούμενον (v. 16), מְכַרְכְּרִים/ἀνεκρούμενον (v. 16).

⁵²³ Murray 1998: 134; cf. Campbell 1975: 138; Driver 1890: §135 [I], p. 166; Fokkelman 1990: 195; Kleven 1991: 373; 1992: 309; Polzin 1993: 61.

⁵²⁴ Gelandner 1991: 47. With regard to Samuel, Seow 1989: 118-131 discusses the language of Psalms 29 and 47 and the ascent of Baal to his mount of victory in the Ugaritic literature, focusing on the royal connection of the verb 'ly in West Semitic, and he is thereby enabled to confer the notion of enthronement on David's and 'Yahweh's' ascent to Jerusalem. With regard to Chronicles, Johnstone 1997: I: 189 thinks the participle מעלים is a word play on מעל, which in 1 Chronicles is applied only to Judah (9.1) and Saul (10.13).

⁵²⁵ This view is supported by (a) the wording of Ps. 47.6, which is either an allusion or ritual re-enactment of 2 Sam. 6.15, and by (b) the use of עלה as a technical term for the procession of the ark *up to the sanctuary on the hill* (1 Sam. 6.21; 7.1; 2 Sam. 6.2, 12, 15; 1 Kgs. 8.1, 4; 1 Chron. 13.6; 15.3, 12, 14, 25, 28; 2 Chron. 1.4; 5.2, 5). See *HALOT* II, 828-830. On the ark's epithets see appendix 2.

The versions differ regarding two issues in the first clause of this material. First, the ark's epithet in Samuel is 'Yahweh' whereas it is 'God' in Chronicles, except for the Targum and Peshitta of Chronicles which have 'Yahweh'.⁵²⁶ Second, LXX Samuel and Chronicles disagree concerning the grammatical forms and lexemes used to represent ויבא. Greek Samuel has a present active indicative verb form whereas Greek Chronicles has an aorist active indicative form, but the use of the historical present in Greek Samuel, as well as the use of φέρω rather than ἐλσφέρω in LXX^{AB} Samuel, are inner-Greek issues which do not require additional discussion.

The H stem of בוא means 'bring (in/near), introduce, conduct, lead' and is normally accompanied by an adverbial modifier(s) expressing either or both the origin or destination from or to which the object of the verb is brought. For example, this is the case in 35 of 42 cases of the H stem of בוא in the book of Samuel.⁵²⁷ Nevertheless, the geographical goal of the transfer is clear, עיר דוד (2 Sam. 6.10 // 1 Chron. 13.13; 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29; 2 Sam. 6.12; 1 Chron. 15.1). The absence from 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 causes the focus of the narrative to fall on David's placement of the ark '(in its place) inside the tent'.⁵²⁸

The analysis of the second clause of this material looks at three issues: (1) the verb יצג with its object; (2) the modifying adverbial phrase describing where the ark was placed; and (3) the defining relative clause introduced by אשר.

First, the Semitic versions use a form of *qwm* or *sym* to represent יצג since the latter has no known cognate outside Hebrew. The OG of Chronicles is ἀπηρείσαντο (from ἀπερείδομαι, 'fix, set on/upon') and in spite of the varied evidence for the reading

⁵²⁶ See appendix 2.

⁵²⁷ The exceptions are 1 Sam. 1.22; 15.20; 16.12; 18.27; 2 Sam. 5.2; 6.17; 9.10.

⁵²⁸ Consequently, Murray 1998: 137 n. 81 is correct to say: 'Thus, although the bringing of the ark by our David into his city is undoubtedly implicated by our narrative as being highly significant for Jerusalem, in making his analogy with Mesopotamian texts concerning the inauguration of new royal cities, McCarter ... is seduced into rather misrepresenting the focus of our text, in the interests of his alleged parallels'.

in Samuel it is clear that a form of τίθημι is the OG reading in that book.⁵²⁹ The verb יָצַח ('set, place') is relatively uncommon⁵³⁰, occurring only sixteen times. The fact that the verb appears only in 1 Sam. 5.2 and 2 Sam. 6.17 in Samuel and only in 1 Chron. 16.1 in Chronicles is unquestionably intentional and significant. See below. *BDB* considers יָצַח 'a vivid and forcible syn. of שָׁחַד'⁵³¹ and Meier concurs⁵³², as does B. Johnson: 'The choice of [יָצַח] in a particular context means ... that the speaker sees a special importance in the act of placing'.⁵³³ Indeed, יָצַח is fitting for the climax of David's ark transfer.

Second, the adverbial phrase describing where the ark was deposited survives in two forms. A bipartite tradition is found in most versions of Chronicles (MT, LXX, Targum, OL, Vulgate), as well as in the Peshitta and Jacob versions of Samuel, and evidently also in Josephus. A tripartite tradition is reflected in most versions of Samuel (MT, LXX, Targum, OL, Vulgate), as well as in the Peshitta of Chronicles. The affiliation of 4QSam^a is unclear. Herbert reconstructs the text with מִקְוֶה⁵³⁴ whereas Fincke and McCarter do not include this noun.⁵³⁵ Almost all agree that the reference to מִקְוֶה was omitted from Chronicles 'for some reason'.⁵³⁶ However, this is unlikely. McCarter is

⁵²⁹ It is unclear whether the form was simple or composite (ἀνα-, ἀπο- or ἐπιτίθημι). It is fairly certain, however, that the form of the verb was an aorist active indicative third person plural. It is noteworthy that excepting 2 Sam. 6.17 and Judg. 6.37 (where LXX^{AMN} and many cursives have the lexeme ἀπερείδομαι rather than LXX^B's τίθημι) there is no significant lexical variation in the Greek version for any other occurrence of יָצַח.

⁵³⁰ Other verbs belonging to the semantic category of 'placement, appointment, stand, station' are שָׁחַד II (6 times), נָצַח I (74 times), עָרַךְ (75 times), שָׁחַ (83 times), כָּוֵן (218 times), עָמַד (522 times), שָׁם (612 times), קָוָה (662 times), נָתַן (2017 times).

⁵³¹ *BDB* 426.

⁵³² Meier 1997: 501: 'Of the sixteen occurrences of יָצַח, some are largely synonymous with שָׁחַד and שָׁחַ (cf. Gen 30:38, 41, 42), but a persistent overtone of willful, deliberate, or intentional action (Judg 7:5; Hos 2:3 [5]), often in the context of formal presentation (Gen 43:9; 47:2; Amos 5:15) and cultic establishments (Judg 8:27; 1 Sam 5:2; 2 Sam 6:17 [// 1 Chr 16:1]), seems peculiar to and characteristic of only this vb'.

⁵³³ B. Johnson 1990: 251-252.

⁵³⁴ Herbert 1997b: 127.

⁵³⁵ Fincke 2001: 156; McCarter 1984: 167.

⁵³⁶ De Vries 1989: 147.

correct to conclude that Chronicles displays the primitive situation.⁵³⁷ Indeed, the Chronicler's supposed deletion would be extraordinary in light of the dual reference to the preparation of this 'place' in 1 Chron. 15.1, 3, and Chronicles' inclusion of מקום in 1 Chron. 21.22, 25 unlike its exclusion in synoptic 2 Sam. 24.21, 24 is not irrelevant to the discussion. Scholars' 'for some reason' is reason-less.

The noun מקום is used about four-hundred times and frequently refers to religious places, both unclean/profane and clean/sacred sites. A theophany of Yahweh may occur at a מקום, and a מקום may be a place of worship, where an altar is built and sacrifice(s) is made. Deuteronomy's המקום אשר יבחר יהוה is significant for the notion of centralised worship (cf. Deuteronomy 12), which many scholars believe was inspired by Josiah's seventh century BCE reform (2 Kings 22–23), and which is supposedly the Deuteronomist's principal doctrine: one God, one priesthood, one altar, and *one place of worship*. Most hold that this place was (in) Jerusalem, but some have argued that the 'place' where God causes his name to dwell was not a single place but rather multiple places, so that other worship centres were not precluded. In biblical narrative (Genesis–Kings, Ezra–Chronicles), interestingly, מקום is used in these religious senses in many passages, and most frequently in Chronicles outside the Pentateuch.

In addition to the suggestion of McCarter that the insertion of מקום in 2 Sam. 6.17 derives from 1 Kgs. 8.6⁵³⁸, scholars make three very different connections, two literary and one historical.⁵³⁹ First, יצג in 1 Sam. 5.2 and 2 Sam. 6.17, and מקום in 1 Sam. 5.3, 11; 6.2 and 2 Sam. 6.17, suggest a close connection between these passages: 'Nous avons donc ici comme la contrepartie positive de cet épisode malheureux, qui met un point final

⁵³⁷ McCarter 1984: 167.

⁵³⁸ McCarter 1984: 167.

⁵³⁹ In addition, Murray 1998: 137 n. 80 thinks מקום refers to some kind of pedestal within the tent; and Cross 1959: 222; G. H. Davies 1962b: 506; and Keil and Delitzsch 1866: 337, think מקום refers to the inner sanctuary (קדש הקדשים / דביר) of the tent. Neither suggestion has much worth.

aux pérégrinations de l'arche dans la perspective de l'auteur commun à ces deux passages'.⁵⁴⁰ Alternatively, the insertion of מקום in 2 Sam. 6.17 may derive from the pen of the composer(s) of the (canonically) earlier ark story. Second, surprisingly few emphasise the theme of the ark's home which closely links 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16, and 2 Samuel 7 // 1 Chronicles 17.⁵⁴¹ Third, 'in its place' (במקומו) is taken by some as an allusion to a pre-existing Jebusite sanctuary which stood on the 'threshing floor of Araunah'.⁵⁴² Those taking this view go on to argue that the following definition בתוך האהל 'is really superfluous and is not prepared for in any way by the course of the narrative; ... So it probably comes from the reviser who oriented the ark narrative on the earliest stage of Nathan's promise (2 Sam 7:1-4a...11b...16)'.⁵⁴³ 'In its place' (במקומו) could refer to a Jebusite sanctuary, but the scenario just described requires excessive historical supposition and insufficiently considers the belatedness of מקום in 2 Sam. 6.17, which was probably not 'dans le texte primitif' as suggested by Vermeulen.⁵⁴⁴

The noun אהל ('tent') is used 345 times in the Bible for a travelling or immobile dwelling for human or divine inhabitation, although it is only one member in a group of terms referring to the deity's residence. Examples of such terms in the book of Samuel are אהל (1 Sam. 2.22; 2 Sam. 6.17; 7.6); בית ('house, temple'), either alone (2 Sam. 7.5-7, 13) or as בית יהוה (1 Sam. 1.7, 24; 3.15; 2 Sam. 12.20)⁵⁴⁵; היכל ('palace, temple'; 1 Sam. 1.9; 3.3; 2 Sam. 22.7); יריעה ('[tent]-curtain'; 2 Sam. 7.2); משכן ('sanctuary, tabernacle'; 2 Sam.

⁵⁴⁰ Caquot and de Robert 1994: 417; cf. A. A. Anderson 1989: 106; Campbell 1975: 139.

⁵⁴¹ Eslinger 1994: 14-15, 42 correctly emphasises the importance of the relationship in 2 Samuel 6–7, but Gakuru 2000 and Schniedewind 1999a do not properly relate the chapters. Also see the relevant discussions throughout Carlson 1964; Gelandner 1991; Murray 1998.

⁵⁴² Albertz 1994: I, 129-130.

⁵⁴³ Albertz 1994: I, 296.

⁵⁴⁴ Vermeulen 2000: 231; cf. 230-231, 684.

⁵⁴⁵ Also see 1 Sam. 5.2, 5; 7.1; 31.10; 2 Sam. 6.3-4, 10, 12.

7.6); and נוה ('habitation, dwelling-place'; 2 Sam. 15.25).⁵⁴⁶ Scholars focus their exposition of 2 Sam. 6.17 on the identification of David's אהל. How is David's אהל related to the above mentioned terms for the deity's residence? Furthermore, how is David's אהל related to other biblical אהלים, most notably אהל מועד⁵⁴⁷, but also to האהל⁵⁴⁸, אהל העדות⁵⁴⁹, and אהל יהוה⁵⁵⁰? *The persistent issue in this verse is the relationship of David's אהל to the wilderness tent/tabernacle.* The secondary literature on this issue is considerable. According to the once widely-accepted view of Wellhausen:

The representation of the tabernacle arose out of the temple of Solomon as its root, in dependence on the sacred ark, for which there is early testimony, and which in the time of David, and also before it, was sheltered by a tent. From the temple it derives at once its inner character and its central importance for the cultus as well as its external form.⁵⁵¹

With few exceptions scholars concur with Wellhausen that the ark–tent association has a lengthy history, but the trend in recent generations is to reject Wellhausen's view that the priestly portrayal of the tent/tabernacle is merely an idealised *retrojection* of the temple in Jerusalem to the wilderness period of Israel's history. Rather, the attribution (by some) of 'P' to the Iron Age together with the citation of Bronze Age comparative examples has caused some to assert that David's tent was new, but not novel, in that it was intended as a *recollection* of the earlier wilderness tent/tabernacle. Therefore, on one hand, David's tent is an early predecessor of the later yet retrojected wilderness tent/tabernacle, and on the other hand, David's tent is an early successor to the still earlier wilderness tent/tabernacle. In both scenarios David's tent is considered a primitive and reliable example of the ark–

⁵⁴⁶ Another related term, but unused in Samuel, is מקדש ('sanctuary'). Two other terms to keep in mind are מזבח ('altar'; 1 Sam. 2.28, 33; 7.17; 14.35; 2 Sam. 24.18, 21, 25) and במה ('high place'; 1 Sam. 9.12–14, 19, 25; 10.5, 13 [cf. 2 Sam. 1.19, 25; 22.34]).

⁵⁴⁷ 133 times in Exodus–Numbers and 13 times elsewhere: Deut. 31.14; Josh. 18.1; 19.51; 1 Sam. 2.22; 1 Kgs. 8.4; 1 Chron. 6.17; 9.21; 23.32; 2 Chron. 1.3, 6, 13; 5.5.

⁵⁴⁸ 32 times in Exodus and Numbers and seven times elsewhere: Deut. 31.15; 1 Kgs. 1.39; 8.4 // 2 Chron. 5.5; 1 Chron. 9.19, 23.

⁵⁴⁹ Num. 9.15; 17.22–23; 18.2; 2 Chron. 24.6.

⁵⁵⁰ 1 Kgs. 2.28–30.

⁵⁵¹ Wellhausen 1885: 45; cf. 17–51.

deity's ark.⁵⁵⁴ Some associate 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 with Exod. 33.7 due to נִסְחָלוּ in both passages, although the referent of לוֹ in the former set of passages is more clearly the ark than it is in the latter passage. Based on this catch-phrase Johnstone suggests that the ark story portrays David as a new Moses.⁵⁵⁵ This may be, but the direction of influence is unclear.

5.1.2.4 2 Sam. 6.19-20
1 Chron. 16.43

וַיִּלֶךְ כָּל־הָעָם אִישׁ לְבֵיתוֹ וַיֵּשֶׁב דָּוִד
וַיֵּלְכוּ כָל־הָעָם אִישׁ לְבֵיתוֹ וַיִּסֹּב דָּוִד

The differences between Chronicles' וילכו and ויסב with reference to Samuel's וילך and וישב are unrelated to 'late' Hebrew. The different verb in MT Samuel (וישב) and MT Chronicles (ויסב) is explained by Japhet as a case of phonetic confusion, and she concludes that it is not clear which text is original.⁵⁵⁶ An analysis of translation equivalents in the Septuagint does not permit a decision regarding the Hebrew *Vorlagen* in 2 Sam. 6.20 and 1 Chron. 16.43. Nevertheless, the entirety of the evidence suggests that one would expect the verb שִׁב rather than סִב in the phrase 'David ____ to bless his house'.⁵⁵⁷

Following 2 Sam. 6.19a // 1 Chron. 16.3, Chronicles has a lengthy expansion prior to the resumption of the shared story. Chronicles' supplement relates David's appointment of levitical musicians and singers and his/their psalm of thanksgiving. The absence in Chronicles of the material on Michal in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is discussed in the next chapter. For now it is sufficient to observe that the finale in 2 Samuel 6 is a more pointed *religious* focus and climax in 1 Chronicles 16. The Chronicler by no means neglects the supremacy of David's dynasty over Saul's, but this theme is subordinated to, or better encompassed

⁵⁵⁴ Exod. 33.7; 2 Sam. 6.17; 1 Chron. 15.1; 16.1; 2 Chron. 1.4.

⁵⁵⁵ Johnstone 1997: I, 190, 242.

⁵⁵⁶ Japhet 1987: 41.

⁵⁵⁷ See appendix 3.

by, David's religious accomplishments. Indeed, the ark's transfer sets the stage for Solomon's future accomplishments.⁵⁵⁸

The dual departure in 2 Sam. 6.19b-20a // 1 Chron. 16.43 leads to a denouement following significant movement and activity in the story of David's transfer of the ark. Again, the dual theme of 'blessing' and 'house' is brought into focus.⁵⁵⁹

5.1.3 The Attendant Circumstances of the Ark's Transfer

5.1.3.1 2 Sam. 6.12
1 Chron. 15.25

בשמחה

All witnesses reflect בשמחה; thus the brief observations here concern literary rather than textual factors. The predominant vocabulary of 'joy', the verb שמח ('rejoice'), the noun שמחה ('joy'), and the adjective שמח ('joyful'), appears most frequently in Isaiah and Chronicles (25 times in each book) next to Proverbs (28 times) and Psalms (68 times). It is noteworthy that only four of Chronicles 25 occurrences are in synoptic material and then at significant junctures in each case.⁵⁶⁰ Is this coincidence? In any case, the theme of 'joy' is closely linked with cultic activity in biblical literature, and indeed it appears in all three ark stories: 1 Sam. 6.13 (also LXX 1 Sam. 6.19⁵⁶¹); 2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25; 1 Kgs. 8.66 // 2 Chron. 7.10. In the story at hand, שמח in 2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25 resumes the joyous *fête* of 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 following Uzzah's execution and David's ensuing anger and fear, and 'joy' also encapsulates the mood of the remainder of the story.⁵⁶²

⁵⁵⁸ 2 Chronicles 5–7; esp. 5.12–13; 6.14, 42; 7.3–4, 6. See 1.2.3.

⁵⁵⁹ On David's blessing see 5.1.1.2, 5.1.3.5, 5.1.3.9, 5.1.3.10.

⁵⁶⁰ 2 Sam. 6.12 // 1 Chron. 15.25; 1 Kgs. 8.66 // 2 Chron. 7.10; 2 Kgs. 11.14, 20 // 2 Chron. 23.13, 21.

⁵⁶¹ See the note on this passage in 4.1.2.2.

⁵⁶² The significance of this theme is discussed further in 5.1.3.5.

The phrase בתרועה ובקול שופר is attested uniformly. An analysis of the dissimilar terminology in LXX Samuel and Chronicles reveals nothing regarding the history of the biblical text or its interpretation by the Greek translators.⁵⁶³ 'Shouts' (תרועה) and 'trumpets' (חצצרה, שופר) are frequently mentioned together and on some occasions a particular phrase may be a hendiadys.⁵⁶⁴ The adjuncts תרועה and קול שופר announce (forewarn?) the ark's (Yahweh's?) arrival in the city of David. They did not accompany the ark *en route* from Obed-edom's בית to the City of David, movement which in fact *is not related in the narrative*.

The noun תרועה has the general meanings 'shout' (of a voice) or 'blast' (of a trumpet) and one sometimes determines with difficulty which meaning is intended. Furthermore, it is difficult to clearly distinguish between secular and religious uses of תרועה, especially in the context of warfare.⁵⁶⁵ Commentators often overlook the fact that, excepting a few cases in the Latter Prophets and Writings, תרועה recurrently appears *at times of initiation or accomplishment*, as an alarm or an announcement. This thread of usage is an argument against the view that the ark story intends to depict activity throughout the duration of the ark's conveyance, rather than at the point of David's and the ark's ascent and arrival. The essence of תרועה here is a jubilant announcement (or is it a warning alarm?) of the ark's (Yahweh's?) arrival in the city of David. Finally, the verb רוע ('shout, give a blast') and the noun רע ('shouting') are cognates of תרועה, and the former occurs in Samuel in 1 Sam. 4.5; 10.24; 17.20, 52. The occurrence in 1 Sam. 4.5 is an

⁵⁶³ The transliteration of שופר by σωφέ/άρ rather than its translation with σάλπιγξ is due to the fact that the translator of Chronicles reserved the latter for חצצרה. The noun κρατίνη also represents שופר in portions of certain books but it occurs in Chronicles only once and then in the revised texts (= LXX^{AL}) of 2 Chron. 15.14. It is unnecessary to discuss this passage further.

⁵⁶⁴ Bressan 1960: 528.

⁵⁶⁵ Longman 1997: 1083.

additional link between the stories of the ark in Samuel and also substantiates the point made above regarding the ark's ascent and arrival.

The curved goat's or ram's horn (i.e., it is non-metallic) as a wind instrument is typically designated by שופר.⁵⁶⁶ The noun appears 72 times in the Bible including 20 occurrences in the phrase קול (ה)שופר. Whereas the noun's origin is obscure, its function is clear: to proclaim, remind, inspire or summon in civil, military or liturgical contexts. The שופר is part of an ensemble only in Ps. 98.6 and 150.3, and in Chronicles' supplement to 1 Chron. 15.28.⁵⁶⁷ The noun occurs predominately in battle and cultic contexts. 'Such cultic uses may relate to the religious significance of the שופר as an awe-inducing instrument'.⁵⁶⁸ McCarter and Robinson correctly relate the mention of the שופר to the proclamation of the ark's (and its deity's) ascent and arrival.⁵⁶⁹

Chronicles' supplement in 1 Chron. 15.28 is in line with 13.8 and 15.16, 19-21, 24, and reflects the book's special interest in music. Music was important in both secular and religious contexts in the ancient world, as also reflected in the Bible, and especially in Chronicles' non-synoptic material. It is unnecessary to address the details in Chronicles' supplement.⁵⁷⁰

5.1.3.3 2 Sam. 6.13
 1 Chron. 15.26

ויהי כי צעדו נשאי ארון־יהוה ששה צעדים //
ויהי בעזר האלהים את־הלויים נשאי ארון ברית־יהוה

The proposal summarised in the following pages requires a full chapter to argue thoroughly, so important primary and secondary evidence is excluded. In short, a thorough analysis of the versions suggests that Samuel's צעד-clause and Chronicles' עזר-

⁵⁶⁶ Other terms are יובל, קרן, קרן היובל, and שופר היובל. See appendix 3 on the statement in BDB 1051: 'horn, mostly as used in war, rarely, and chiefly late, as sacred instr'.

⁵⁶⁷ The standard musical instruments in ensembles were idiophones and chordophones.

⁵⁶⁸ O'Connell 1997: 68.

⁵⁶⁹ McCarter 1984: 172; Robinson 1993: 183.

⁵⁷⁰ See appendix 3 on the statement in BDB 348 that הצצרה is 'mostly P and late'. This noun in Chronicles is the priests' instrument *par excellence*.

clause developed independently, perhaps from a more simple and less explicit report like the one in LXX and OL Samuel and in several other witnesses.

The verb וַיְהִי in MT Samuel and MT Chronicles (and also וַיְהִי in 4QSam^a and καὶ ἐγένετο in Chronicles) is an impersonal introductory or preparatory formula, which together with the following preposition (כִּי in MT Samuel and 4QSam^a, בְּ/ἐν in Chronicles) forms a subordinate temporal clause.⁵⁷¹

MT Samuel and 4QSam^a continue with the verb צָעַד, a *qatal* 3cp form from the root צָעַד, generally rendered 'walk, step, pace, advance, stride, march', although most modern English translations simply have 'had gone' in 2 Sam. 6.13. It is necessary to bypass a discussion of Hebrew and Semitic cognates in order to focus on the distribution of צָעַד and its three main associated nouns: twice in 'archaic' poetry (Jacob's blessing and Deborah's song), four times in Samuel, three or four times in the Latter Prophets, and 18 times in the Writings. Seow links צָעַד in David's transfer of the ark with 'the march of the divine warrior' in other biblical and non-biblical literature, but more significant for the present discussion is his point that 'not enough attention has been paid to the vocabulary of David's procession', especially the lexical and sequential similarities between Yahweh's פָּרָץ and צָעַד in 2 Sam. 5.20, 24 // 1 Chron. 14.11, 15, and Yahweh's פָּרָץ and David's צָעַד in 2 Sam. 6.8, 13 // 1 Chron. 13.11; 15.25.⁵⁷² The choice of צָעַד rather than more common verbs such as דָּרַךְ and הִלֵּךְ, and the distribution of the terminology as a whole, are not arbitrary. Yahweh's פָּרָץ against the Philistines and his subsequent צָעַד are analogous to

⁵⁷¹ Many translators and commentators give Chronicles' בְּ/ἐν a causal meaning. The extensive evidence against this interpretation cannot be presented here. Briefly, causal clauses in biblical Hebrew are normally expressed by one of seven particles (אֲשֶׁר, כִּי, יַעַן, מִן, עַל, כִּי, וְעַתָּה) either alone or compounded. In addition, ellipsis, asyndeton, disjunction, and even *wayyiqtol* may give rise to causal interpretations. JM §170j, pp. 639-640, correctly says 'ב' rarely has a nuance which strictly speaking is causal'. Jenni 1992: 324, 355, correctly construes 1 Chron. 15.26 as temporal. Kropat 1909: §6, p. 23; §31, p. 68, inadvertently cites the verse in his discussions of both temporal and causal clauses. Finally, וַיְהִי + בְּ + infinitive occurs 44 times in the Bible, always with a manifestly temporal nuance. See appendix 3.

⁵⁷² Seow 1989: 104-107.

Yahweh's פָּרַץ against Uzzah and David's responsive צַעַד (*with עָז in 2 Sam. 6.14*), a response which can be interpreted as a victory won by David. See 4.1.3.2.

Most scholars believe Chronicles' בָּעֹזֵר⁵⁷³ / ἐν τῷ κατισχύσαι rather than Samuel's צַעַד is a 'change' related to Chronistic *Tendenz*, but some grant the Chronicler a measure of neutrality by relating the 'change' to a corrupt or misunderstood *Vorlage*. The verb עֹזֵר occurs 81 times and 25 of these are in Chronicles whereas only four are in Samuel. The related common nouns עֹזֵר and עֲזָרָה do not appear in Samuel, and the latter is found only once in Chronicles. It is also significant that 21 names of people and places in the Bible incorporate the root עֹזֵר, and 15 of these occur in Chronicles.⁵⁷⁴ The root עֹזֵר is normally used in contexts describing human or divine aid against enemies (especially in narrative texts) or in times of distress (especially in poetic texts). In these texts the focus is on cooperation, rather than on the nature or duration of the action, which could be either punctiliar or durative. Israel's deity is the subject or provider of עֹזֵר in about half of the verses in which the verb and nouns occur. In 1 Chron. 15.26 the deity's assistance is the collective experience of the Levites, and this is the only passage where they are the object of divine עֹזֵר. Chronicles' interest in the Levites is evident in the fact that the book has 32% of all occurrences of לֵוִי and לְוִיִּם in the Bible, followed by Numbers with 21% and Nehemiah with 13%, whereas these are virtually absent from the Former Prophets, and especially Samuel, where they are mentioned only twice (1 Sam. 6.15; 2 Sam. 15.24). 1 Chron. 15.26 has been *interpreted* and assimilated to the preceding plus in 1 Chron. 15.1-24, reflecting the Chronicler's interests in promoting liturgical propriety according to (Pentateuchal?—see v. 15) cultic legislation, stressing David's uprightness through compliance with the divine mandate, and demonstrating God's protective care for the

⁵⁷³ On the vocalisation בָּעֹזֵר rather than the expected בְּעֹזֵר see *GKC* §63i, p. 167; *JM* §22a-d, pp. 89-90; Bergsträsser 1918: I, §28k, p. 156; Bauer and Leander 1922: §49h, p. 348; cf. Ehrlich 1914: 341.

⁵⁷⁴ See appendix 3.

Levites in contrast to Uzzah. Most importantly, God 'helped' the Levites in the sense that 'they were not struck down, as Uzzah had been (13:10)'.⁵⁷⁵

A very different situation confronts us upon turning to Greek Samuel: καὶ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν ([οἱ] αἰρουντες)—no עזר and no עזר/κατισχύω. In addition, very similar forms of the text, or at least forms devoid of 'step' and 'help', appear in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 7.84, Jacob of Edessa's *Books of Samuel*, and Theodoret of Cyrus' *Quaestiones in 2 Regum*. Similarly, the OL according to Sabatier and Vercellone has a double reading: *et erant cum David septem chori (et victima vituli)* at the end of 2 Sam. 6.12, followed in the next verse by *cumque transcendissent (qui portabant arcam Domini sex passus immolabat bovem et arietem)*. Most suppose that Greek Samuel's καὶ ἦσαν is an adjustment of MT Samuel's ויהי.⁵⁷⁶ On one hand, καὶ ἦσαν may reflect free composition, but on the other, ויהי may be an assimilation to the ubiquitous narrative stock phrase. In general, and especially in *Samuel*, ויהי is rendered as καὶ ἐγένετο or καὶ ἐγενήθη when the verb is introductory, and as καὶ ἦν when it is copulative.⁵⁷⁷ In addition, a comprehensive analysis of καὶ ἦσαν in the Greek Bible suggests that the translator found ויהי in his Hebrew *Vorlage*.⁵⁷⁸ Herbert thinks Greek Samuel's καὶ ἦσαν corresponds to 4QSam^a's ויהי but this is doubtful.⁵⁷⁹ Greek Samuel's καὶ ἦσαν ... [οἱ] αἰρουντες can be

⁵⁷⁵ Payne 1988: 388. God's help is his favourable disposition. Others think God helped by easing the heavy burden of the ark. Brettler 1995: 33-34 and Ehrlich 1914: 341 relate the verb עזר to the Talmudic notion in Sotah 35a.29-37 that the ark transported itself and its bearers.

⁵⁷⁶ The variation in the versions with respect to the initial verb phrase (ויהי, ויהי, καὶ ἦσαν, καὶ ἐγένετο), and similar variations elsewhere, merits a lengthy discussion since the phenomenon helps to clarify misconceptions regarding the history of biblical Hebrew and the linguistic aptitude of post-exilic editors and scribes. See appendix 3.

⁵⁷⁷ ויהי and καὶ ἦσαν correspond on only seven occasions in biblical literature. On six of these the Greek reading is related to the manner of expression in the Greek language. ויהי in MT 2 Chron. 5.9 (// 1 Kgs. 8.8) is an assimilation to the ubiquitous narrative stock phrase.

⁵⁷⁸ Space does not present a detailed presentation, but it is noteworthy that in Samuel καὶ ἦσαν represents ויהי five times, ויהי once, and once MT has a minus, and six times MT does not have a parallel passage. See appendix 3.

⁵⁷⁹ Herbert 1997b: 126. He also suggests that καὶ ἦσαν could conceivably be a translation of a clause beginning with ויהי. He mistakenly cites 2 Sam. 17.17 as an example. Furthermore, this writer is unaware of

interpreted as a periphrastic participle construction or as a copulative construction in which case [οἱ] αἰροντες is a substantival participle. However, the (superfluous) inclusion of the article in LXX^L and Theodoret (and also in the Armenian, Coptic and Ethiopic versions) and the grammar of the remainder of the *list* (ἐπὶ τὰ χοροὶ ...; see below) suggest that the clause in Greek Samuel is a copulative construction. The essence of this third textform is *accompaniment*, either implicitly as in Josephus, or alternatively as 'with them', 'with him', 'with David' or 'after him'. The primary reading is 'with them' (LXX^{ABMN} and most cursives, Jacob and Theodoret), is attested most widely, is the *lectio difficilior* considering internal factors, and could easily have given rise to the singular referent 'him' and secondarily 'David'. Besides David others are involved in the second attempt to transfer the ark, as in the first attempt. The OG reading is μετ' αὐτῶν = עִמָּם/עִמָּהֶם with reference to the ark carriers' presence with David and other Israelites, whereas μετ' αὐτοῦ = עִמּוֹ and *cum David* = עִם דָּוִד are secondary readings influenced by the contextual focus on David and with reference to the ark carriers' presence with him.

The grammatical function of 'the carriers' varies in the versions. In MT Samuel and 4QSam^a they are the subject of the verb צָעַד. In Greek Samuel they are one of three subjects of καὶ ἦσαν. In Chronicles they stand in apposition to the preceding 'the Levites' which in turn is the object of the verb עָזַר. 'The carriers' are unidentified in Samuel, and this may be due to the focus on David and his role. Does 2 Sam. 6.13 share the Chronicler's perspective? Does David now take Yahweh seriously? Should 'the carriers' be interpreted as (Kohathite) Levites who are 'correctly' transporting the ark according to legal stipulations? Many answer these questions affirmatively, but this view stands on shaky ground. The points stated in 4.1.2.2 against the view that David and/or Uzzah

a single biblical example where καὶ ἦσαν represents וְהָמָה/וְהָם. καὶ ἦσαν corresponds to וְהָם in Gen. 40.6 and to וְהָמָה in Exod. 39.43, and וְהָם corresponds to οἱ ἦσαν in Gen. 14.13 and וְהָמָה to καὶ οὗτοι ἦσαν in Num. 11.26.

violated legal stipulations are equally valid here, and the following may be added. First, priests (and often Levites alongside them) are explicitly mentioned in 28 of the 34 verses where *נשא* has *אֶרֶן* as its object. In addition to 2 Sam. 6.3, 4, 13, the exceptions are Exod. 25.14 and 37.5 which discuss the construction of the ark, and 1 Sam. 4.4 where the priests Hophni and Phinehas are mentioned by name. In all 15 verses where the substantival participle *נשאים* or its construct equivalent are used, with the single exception of 2 Sam. 6.13, priests (and sometimes Levites) are explicitly mentioned. Second, the view that 'the carriers' must be identical in each version or tradition is eisegetic and harmonistic for interpretative or ideological comfort. It is methodologically unjustified to read into 2 Sam. 6.13 the Chronicler's perspective, or the statement of 2 Sam. 15.24, or (canonically) earlier Pentateuchal legislation. Third, this view implicitly or explicitly reflects a questionable interpretation of the earlier attempt to transfer the ark to Jerusalem, namely, that it was done illicitly. The writer argued previously that Yahweh's homicidal anger against Uzzah is inexplicable. Fourth, other interpretations of 2 Sam. 6.13 are more reasonable in this context. Several suggest that the switch from *עגלה* to *הנשאים* reflects practical considerations, since the ascent to the citadel of David's city was probably too steep and winding for a wheeled vehicle. Others conclude, correctly in this writer's judgment, that David was so fearful that he made every safeguard to avoid the former debacle, and for this reason he transported the ark with human hands and shoulders rather than on a cart.⁵⁸⁰

Regarding the ark's epithet, 'the ark' in Greek Samuel is original. The text is revised in MT Samuel, followed by LXX^L Samuel⁵⁸¹, and in Chronicles.⁵⁸²

⁵⁸⁰ A. A. Anderson 1989: 105; Budde 1890: 230; Gehrke 1968: 263; Sunoo 1999: 73-74.

⁵⁸¹ Nysse 1984: 366-367, 474.

⁵⁸² See appendix 2.

Greek Samuel's χοροί stands in parallel to MT Samuel's and 4QSam^a's צעדים. The basic meaning of צעד is 'step', either literal 'footstep' or figurative 'steps [i.e., path] of life'. The noun χορός may refer to a dance, a choir or band of dancers and singers, or a place for dancing, although the latter is unattested in the Greek Bible. צעד and χορός overlap somewhat in meaning since both refer to activity done with the feet or legs, but this semantic similarity is insufficient to regard the two words as *translation* equivalents. Furthermore, the noun צעד is not translated consistently in the Greek Bible, but it is translated equitably. δῶβημα, for instance, would have been an appropriate translation equivalent for צעד. Others suggest that the Greek translator understood צעדים as a participle ('those processing')⁵⁸³ or that his *Vorlage* had שבעה חבלים ('seven bands')⁵⁸⁴ or שבעה רוקדים or שבעה מחללים ('seven dancers').⁵⁸⁵ Nonetheless, a thorough analysis of biblical uses and translation equivalents reveals the improbability of these suggestions. For example, חבל I ('band, company'), and its Ugaritic cognate, require a *nomen rectum* explaining the kind of people or animals of which there is a 'band' (cf. 1 Sam. 10.5, 10). In contrast to the abovementioned suggestions, it has gone unnoticed that consistent translation technique and contextual suitability favour the view that χοροί reflects מחלות ('whirling dances, dances in a ring') in the *Vorlage*. This correspondence occurs in a dozen passages, including three in Samuel, and interestingly, in the latter the terminology refers to the persons singing the pro-David refrain 'Saul has killed his thousands, and David his ten thousands' (1 Sam. 18.6; 21.12; 29.5⁵⁸⁶; cf. 5.1.1.3).⁵⁸⁷ Samuel's editors may have discarded מחלות, thus unfastening an outlying link between the David and Saul

⁵⁸³ Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie 2003: 665.

⁵⁸⁴ Fincke 2001: 155; Ulrich 1978: 196.

⁵⁸⁵ Jackson 1962: 104.

⁵⁸⁶ In lieu of χοροί a participle form of the related verb χορεύω is used as a *substantive* in 1 Sam. 18.6 and 21.12.

⁵⁸⁷ The exceptions to this correspondence, in addition to 2 Sam. 6.3 and 1 Sam. 10.5, 10 (mentioned above), are Judg. 9.27; 1 Kgs. 1.40; and Jer. 31.4, 13. These do not cancel out the view suggested here.

narratives, in order to forge by means of [ה] צעד a bond between David and Yahweh in 2 Samuel 5–6. Additionally, it should not go unnoticed that the verb חול and its derivatives מחול and מחלה refer to dancing *women* in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets⁵⁸⁸ except in Exod. 32.19. Was David's festivity too similar for comfort to the calf incident, with its עגל/μυσχός (vv. 4, 8, 19-20, 24), offerings and sacrifices (vv. 6, 8), and self-indulgent partying (vv. 6, 17-19, 25) with מחלות? See 6.1.1.3.4.

MT and LXX Samuel have the numbers ששה and ἑπτά modifying the nouns צעדים and χοροί, respectively, whereas MT and LXX Chronicles have the number שבעה/ἑπτά twice in the next clause, modifying the sacrifices (see 5.1.3.4). 4QSam^a has the reading of MT Samuel as well as the reading of Chronicles. This text-critical problem is complicated due to different numbers in different places, the chance of orthographic (שבעה/ששה) or shorthand (י = 6, י = 7) confusion, and not least, numerical symbolism in the Bible. The number 'seven' is the religious number *par excellence*, the 'prime sacred number'⁵⁸⁹, having the 'divinity of good fortune'.⁵⁹⁰ The number 'six' tells a different story:

In the numeral 6 we have, I believe, the only digit which may be regarded as neutral – with neither favourable nor unfavourable implication; in consequence, it does not appear often. ... The numbers I have just analysed – 4 and 8 and 6 – occur, I have pointed out, comparatively rarely. They are even numbers; and they are found for the most part in contexts of an unpleasing or ill-omened character – 6 is, at best, neutral in significance.⁵⁹¹

The number 'six' is a number in waiting, one less than the sacred number: perfection at seven, or just six, or something worse? Who knows? And who knew how Yahweh would respond? What would the seventh step bring? 'Wait'—says David—'a sacrifice instead'. 'Seven X' for a sacrifice to appease the deity, of course, but 'seven steps' could press him over the edge—again! It may be true: 'Each number had its own significance; and each

⁵⁸⁸ Exod. 15.20; Judg. 11.34; 21:21, 23; 1 Sam. 18.6 (cf. 21.12; 29.5). The verb does not refer to dance in 2 Sam. 3.29.

⁵⁸⁹ Tilley 1992: 48.

⁵⁹⁰ J. B. Segal 1965: 14; cf. 14-19.

⁵⁹¹ J. B. Segal 1965: 13-14.

context dictated the choice of numeral'.⁵⁹² But what can be made of ἑπτὰ χοροί? Seven of these, granting any interpretation—seven dances, seven choirs of dancers, seven bands of dancers—is difficult to comprehend. Perhaps the number is present solely for the sake of the number (revision?), and then 'seven' so that it is *the best* number.

5.1.3.4 2 Sam. 6.13
1 Chron. 15.26

וַיִּזְבַּח שׁוֹר וּמְרִיא //
וַיִּזְבְּחוּ שִׁבְעַת־פָּרִים וְשִׁבְעָה אֵילִים

This and the following section (5.1.3.5) consider the sacrifices made at the start (2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26) and finish (2 Sam. 6.17-18 // 1 Chron. 16.1-2) of David's successful transfer of the ark. The וַיִּזְבַּח-clause in 2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26 has engendered much controversy. (1) When were the sacrifices made? At the commencement, continuously throughout, at the conclusion, or at various points of the procession according to different versions? (2) Where were the sacrifices made? (3) Who sacrificed? David, priests, Levites, others, several of these? (4) Which animals and how many were sacrificed? (5) Why were the sacrifices made? Scholars give different answers to each of these queries. The question of the identification (and its significance) of the agent(s) of these sacrifices is addressed in 5.1.3.5.

There are three principal readings, and one conflate reading, for the activity of sacrifice: (1) וַיִּזְבַּח in MT Samuel and in the following versions of Samuel: Peshitta, Targum, Vulgate, Aquila, Symmachus, and Josephus (but *after* the ark's arrival in Jerusalem, in 7.86). 4QSam^a *may* have the singular וַיִּזְבַּח, but the manuscript certainly reads like Chronicles for the remainder of the verse.⁵⁹³ (2) וַיִּזְבְּחוּ / καὶ ἔθυσαν in MT and LXX Chronicles, and in all other witnesses to Chronicles. The versions of Chronicles hardly differ from one another in this clause except for the matter of ἀν in the OG,

⁵⁹² J. B. Segal 1965: 20.

⁵⁹³ Fincke 2001: 155; Herbert 1997b: 126-127; Ulrich 1978: 196 does not commit.

seemingly indicating potentiality or unreality. (3) $\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha$ ('a sacrifice') in LXX Samuel, a nominative (or accusative) neuter singular noun, which may reflect the noun זֶבַח in the *Vorlage*.⁵⁹⁴ This reading is also found in Theodoret and Jacob. A secondary reading for LXX Samuel is the plural $\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ in ms 119 (n) (and also in the Bohairic Coptic version). (4) The OL according to Sabatier and Vercellone reflects both MT Samuel (*immolabat bovem et arietem* in v. 13) and LXX Samuel (*et victima vituli* in v. 12).

The root זֶבַח is commonplace, occurring 134 times as the verb, 162 times as the noun זֶבַח ('sacrifice'), and 401 times as the noun מִזְבֵּחַ ('altar'), and its distribution is also unexceptional—*except in 2 Samuel* (of Genesis–Kings and Chronicles), where these terms occur a total of only six times, and then in only three passages: 2 Sam. 6.13, 17-18 (// 1 Chron. 15.26; 16.1-2; David); 2 Sam. 15.12 (Absalom); 2 Sam. 24.18-25 (// 1 Chron. 21.18-26; David).

Question 1: When were the sacrifices made? Most think, correctly so, that sacrifices were offered on a single occasion at the commencement of the procession in 2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26. A few, preceded long ago by Sotah 35b.2-4 of the Talmud, think sacrifices were offered repeatedly throughout the journey to Jerusalem.⁵⁹⁵ Recent adherents to this view usually cite McCarter and Miller and Roberts.⁵⁹⁶ In turn, these cite Assyrian inscriptions recounting processions by Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal in which sacrifices were offered all the way from Assur to Babylon—a considerable distance indeed. Consequently, they and others assert that such a procedure in David's case would not have been needlessly cumbersome nor hampered by distance, time, or supplies. If Solomon (1 Kgs. 8.5, 63) then why not David too?! Needless to say, this view rests on

⁵⁹⁴ Contra זֶבַח in Caspari 1924: 473, Driver 1890: 269; McCarter 1984: 166.

⁵⁹⁵ Myers 1965: 119 thinks sacrifices were offered on a single occasion in Chronicles but on multiple occasions in Samuel.

⁵⁹⁶ McCarter 1983: 273-277; 1984: 162, 166, 171; Miller and Roberts 1977: 15, 96.

unwarranted recourse to comparative material and on excessive historical assumption⁵⁹⁷, and it also reflects inattention to the language of MT 2 Sam. 6.13, in which the verb forms in both the protosis (וַיִּהְיֶה כִּי צִעְדּוּ) and apodosis (וַיִּזְבַּח) stand at odds with this interpretation.⁵⁹⁸ McCarter recognises this, and consequently he is constrained to adopt 4QSam^a's וַיִּהְיֶה for the protosis and LXX Sam's καὶ θύμα retroverted to וַיִּזְבַּח for the apodosis.

Question 2: Where were the sacrifices made? The answer to this question is a series of unanswerable questions. Was there a single or multiple altars? If sacrifices were offered on multiple occasions, did an altar accompany the ark along the way, or did it remain at a single location, while the ark slowly progressed but paused every six steps for a sacrifice? How large and of which material(s) (stone, earth, metal) was/were the altar(s)? Do the narratives envision something like Bezalel's portable altar⁵⁹⁹ or an improvised structure (e.g., 1 Sam. 14.33-34)?

Question 3: Who sacrificed? See below.

Question 4: Which animals and how many of them were sacrificed? On one hand, the witnesses to Greek Samuel agree on the lexemes μόσχος (= שׁוֹר or פֶּרֶךְ) and ἀρῆν (= כֶּבֶשׂ, less probably טֵלָה), which are repeatedly joined in Numbers and sporadically elsewhere. On the other hand, variation between the manuscripts regarding the number and/or case of the sacrificial animals is significant, and this variation reflects revision for the purposes of (1) intra- and inter-version harmonisation and/or (2) linguistic correction, the prime example of the latter being the genitive forms in LXX^L Samuel and several additional manuscripts. It is impossible to efficiently describe the textual variation here, especially the accusative forms of μόσχος and ἀρῆν, including the accusative masculine

⁵⁹⁷ Thenius 1842: 153.

⁵⁹⁸ Driver 1890: 269; Thenius 1842: 153; Wellhausen 1871: 169.

⁵⁹⁹ Exod. 27.1-8; 37.1; 37.25-38.7.

singular ἄρνα in LXX^{AB} and several other cursives, which however as the *lectio difficilior* is considered the OG in the Cambridge and Rahlfs editions.⁶⁰⁰ The text of LXX 2 Sam. 6.13 must be rendered 'And there were with them carriers of the ark, seven dances, and a sacrifice, namely, an ox and a lamb':

ויהיו עמהם נשאי ארון שבע מחלת וזבח שור וכבש

The textual situation is equally complex when looking beyond the Greek versions to the gamut of witnesses. All in all there are three patterns of readings, referring to large cattle (= שור or פר or בקר) and small cattle (group 1 = איל; group 2 = כבש or מלה or צאן) or to large cattle and a fattened head of large or small cattle, i.e., a bull, ox, steer, or lamb (= מריא). The latter reading, which may also be interpreted as a hendiadys, appears in the MT, Targum, Aquila and Peshitta versions of Samuel. Scholars usually stress the 'non-priestly' nature of the sacrifices in MT Samuel, although a few highlight the שור as part of the שלמים sacrifice in Lev. 4.10; 9.4, 18-19. שור and מריא are combined elsewhere only in 1 Kgs. 1.19, 25, and elsewhere in the Former Prophets שור occurs only in Judg. 6.25 and מריא only in 1 Kgs. 1.9. מריא is one of five biblical terms for an animal fattened for sacrifice, but overall the concept is uncommon in the Bible. The agreement between 4QSam^a and Chronicles concerning the types and numbers of sacrificial animals is most interesting. The suggestion that the reading in 4QSam^a is derived from Chronicles is unfounded; rather, the evidence suggests that Chronicles closely followed its *Vorlage*.⁶⁰¹ In contrast to MT Samuel, most scholars stress the 'late' and 'priestly' nature of the sacrifices in 4QSam^a and Chronicles, although their minutiae do not correspond to any *legal prescription* in the Pentateuch. פר and איל are frequently joined in the Bible, 46

⁶⁰⁰ The reading may be due either to confusion in case endings in Hellenistic Greek or to confusion over the fact that the noun ἄρνα (a third declension masculine noun) is used for the oblique cases of ἄμνος (a second declension masculine noun).

⁶⁰¹ Lemke 1963: 353; McKenzie 1984: 50; Ulrich 1978: 136, 148, 159, 196, 206, 210, 235.

times in Numbers and 21 times elsewhere.⁶⁰² The sevenfold sacrifice of any kind of animal is uncommon, and seven פרים and seven אילים even less so (Num. 23.1, 29; 1 Chron. 15.26; Job 42.8; Ezek. 45.23). Milgrom and Wenham observe that פרים and אילים are the most expensive, hence efficacious, animals in the sacrificial system, and thus Balaam and Balak are represented as doing their utmost to ensure Yahweh's favourable response.⁶⁰³ Is this the objective in 1 Chron. 15.26? To conclude, the genesis of the present forms of the זבח-clause in 2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26 is uncertain, but Greek Samuel may be the type of text which was independently stretched into the present forms of MT Samuel and MT Chronicles.

Question 5: Why were the sacrifices made? For most interpreters the significance of the commencement sacrifices is twofold: (1) *backward looking* gratitude and celebration for an auspicious beginning and (2) *forward looking* consecration and intercession for a successful completion. In view of (a) the fear and uncertainty running throughout the passage, and of (b) the comments above on פרים and אילים, and of (c) the comments above on the numbers '6' and '7', and of (d) the reasonable observation that 'we may safely presume that the first expedition proceeded more than six paces before Uzzah was struck down'⁶⁰⁴, the first point should be dismissed entirely.

5.1.3.5	2 Sam. 6.17	// ויעל דוד עלות לפני יהוה ושלמים
	1 Chron. 16.1	// ויקריבו עלות ושלמים לפני האלהים
	2 Sam. 6.18	// ויכל דוד מהעלות העולה והשלמים
	1 Chron. 16.2	// ויכל דויד מהעלות העלה והשלמים

The shared narrative of David's transfer of the ark commences and concludes with animal sacrifice. In addition, the theme of sacrifice appears in non-synoptic 1 Chron. 16.29, 40. MT 2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26 relates the sacrifice (זבח) of particular

⁶⁰² Eight in Ezekiel, four in Leviticus and Chronicles, twice in Exodus, and once in Isaiah, Job and Ezra.
⁶⁰³ Milgrom 1989: 194; Wenham 1981: 172.
⁶⁰⁴ Campbell 1975: 138.

animals (אילים and פרים / מריא and שור) which served as consecration and intercession for the successful completion of David's enterprise. MT 2 Sam. 6.17-18 // 1 Chron. 16.1-2 deals with specific categories of sacrifices (שלמים and עלה; עלות and שלמים) which were performed (העלה; הקרב/העלה) as celebration and thanksgiving for the triumphant arrival of the ark to Jerusalem (see below). The theological adverbial 'before Yahweh/God' in 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 is a further difference which can be added to the diverse vocabulary and purpose associated with each set of sacrifices. The question of the identification (and its significance) of the agent(s) of the commencing and concluding sacrifices will be addressed upon the completion of the detailed analysis which follows.

MT 2 Sam. 6.17-18 and MT 1 Chron. 16.1-2 disagree on the verb lexeme for sacrifice (הקרב versus העלה) and on the placement of שלמים in the object clause. Before examining these matters, however, two other issues may be briefly discussed. First, where were the concluding sacrifices made? One supposes either that David prepared a new altar or that he adopted (a Jebusite?) one already there.⁶⁰⁵ Kings assumes that an altar stood in the deity's tent (1 Kgs. 1.49-53; 2.28-35). However, the relationship of the presumed altar in the story of David's transfer of the ark (a) to the altar in the story in non-synoptic 1 Kings 1–2, and also (b) to the altar constructed by David in 2 Samuel 24 // 1 Chronicles 21, cannot be addressed here. Second, in this verse, all traditions of Samuel have 'before Yahweh'. Chronicles has 'before God' with the exceptions of Targum Chronicles with 'before Yahweh' and Peshitta Chronicles with 'before the ark of Yahweh'. In summary⁶⁰⁶, לפני יהוה in contexts of sacrifice is very common in Exodus–Numbers, and occurs elsewhere in Judg. 20.26; 1 Sam. 7.6; 11.15; 2 Sam. 6.17; 1 Kgs. 8.62, 64; 9.25; 2 Kgs. 16.14; Ezek. 43.24; 1 Chron. 23.13, 31; 2 Chron. 1.6; 7.4, 7. In contrast, and in addition to 1 Chron. 16.1, לפני (ה)אלהים in contexts of sacrifice occurs only in Exod. 18.12

⁶⁰⁵ See the discussion of מקום in 5.1.2.3.

⁶⁰⁶ See appendix 2.

and Num. 10.10. Chronicles uses לפני (ה)אלהים on five occasions (1 Chron. 13.8, 10; 16.1; 2 Chron. 33.12; 34.27), but never uses the phrase elsewhere in a context of sacrifice. Instead, לפני יהוה is used in both synoptic and non-synoptic texts. Finally, some suggest that the role of חצצרה in 1 Chron. 15.28 and its use in Num. 10.10 share a common origin⁶⁰⁷, and it seems beyond coincidence that 1 Chron. 16.1 and Num. 10.10 also share the nouns עלה and שלם and the theological adverbial לפני (ה)אלהים. Nevertheless, the direction of influence is uncertain.

Samuel and Chronicles disagree on the verb lexeme for sacrifice, but they share the same meaning.⁶⁰⁸ 2 Sam. 6.17 has העלה and 1 Chron. 16.1 has הקריב. Other versions' readings are unremarkable. The assertion that Chronicles' reading is secondary is unsubstantiated. It is possible that Chronicles' reading is the result of free variation (העלה → הקריב) but it is equally if not more probable that the text of Samuel was altered related either to stylistic assimilation or to catchword influence (הקריב → העלה). First, and on one hand, the verb עלה ('ascend, go up') occurs 889 times, including 258 times in the H stem ('cause to ascend, offer sacrifice'), of which 77 instances are used for the offering of sacrifice, and of these 61 occur in conjunction with the noun עלה.⁶⁰⁹ Fuhs makes the comment that '... Usage [of עלה] is concentrated in the Dtr History (377 occurrences) and the Tetrateuch (169 occurrences). The Chronicler's History *lags well behind* with 104 occurrences. ...'.⁶¹⁰ This is deceptive. The occurrences of עלה make up 1.84% of all verb forms in Deuteronomy–Kings, 1.17% of all verb forms in Genesis–Numbers, and 1.77% of all verb forms in Ezra–Chronicles. On the other hand, the (Hebrew and Aramaic) verb

⁶⁰⁷ See Kleinig 1993: 36.

⁶⁰⁸ Other biblical verb synonyms that approximate the meanings of העלה and הקריב in sacrificial contexts are: זבח ('slaughter'), טבח ('slaughter'), הקטר ('make a sacrifice, cause to go up in smoke'), שחט ('slaughter'), and some occurrences of בוא, נגש, נתן, עשה, and שוב.

⁶⁰⁹ There is no consensus as to whether this usage is meant to express the placing of the sacrifice upon the altar or its rising in smoke.

⁶¹⁰ Fuhs 2001: 80, emphasis added.

קרב ('approach, come near') occurs 289 times, including 177 times in the H stem ('bring near, present'). Altogether, the verb occurs 181 times in the 'Tetrateuch', 44 times in the 'Dtr History', and six times in the 'Chronicler's History'. The verb occurs six times in Samuel in non-sacrificial contexts and two times in Chronicles in sacrificial contexts (synoptic 1 Chron. 16.1; non-synoptic 2 Chron. 35.12). The principal differences between the H stems of עלה and קרב are these: (1) הקריב appears almost exclusively in cultic contexts, whereas the contexts of usage of העלה are wide-ranging. (2) 'P' and Ezekiel prefer הקריב, whereas other strands of biblical literature, including synoptic and non-synoptic Chronicles, prefer העלה.⁶¹¹ Statistics rebuff the view that Chronicles altered העלה to הקריב. Second, Chronicles has שלם + עלה + קריב in 1 Chron. 16.1 but העלה + עלה + קריב in 1 Chron. 16.2, just like 2 Sam. 6.18. Similarly, Chronicles has העלה + עלה in 2 Chron. 35.12 but העלה + עלה twice in 2 Chron. 35.14, 16. *2 Chron. 35.1b-17 is non-synoptic*. It is more likely that an original הקריב in 2 Sam. 6.17 was assimilated to העלה in 2 Sam. 6.18 then vice versa. Third, some believe the Chronicler used 'an expression that is more familiar to him and probably more common in his day'.⁶¹² However, although עלה + הקריב is used in Ezek. 46.4, Ezra 8.35, 2 Chron. 35.12, and in Leviticus–Numbers, עלה + קריב is found in Num. 6.14 and 1 Chron. 16.1 *only*. On what basis is Chronicles' expression more common? Fourth, the verb עלה is a *Leitwort* throughout 2 Samuel 6⁶¹³, and perhaps motivated a tendentious revision in 2 Sam. 6.17. The assonance in Samuel's עלה ... ויעל is also conspicuous. Furthermore, קריב is never used for sacrifice in Deuteronomy–Kings, and this too may support the view that an out-of-place קריב was altered to העלה in 2 Sam. 6.17.

⁶¹¹ Fuhs 2001: 90-91; Japhet 1987: 34.

⁶¹² McKenzie 1984: 51.

⁶¹³ Gelandner 1991: 47-50.

The content of the sacrifices in 2 Sam. 6.17-18 // 1 Chron. 16.1-2 is given in the following table.

2 Sam. 6.17-18		1 Chron. 16.1-2	
MT	LXX	MT	LXX
עֹלֹת	ὀλοκαυτώματα	עֹלָה	ὀλοκαυτώματα
שְׁלָמִים	εἰρηνικός	שְׁלָמִים	(LXX ^L εἰρηνικός καὶ +) σωτηρίου
הַעֹלָה	τὰς ὀλοκαυτώσεις	הַעֹלָה	τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα
הַשְּׁלָמִים	τὰς εἰρηνικός	הַשְּׁלָמִים	(LXX ^L τὰς εἰρηνικός καὶ +) σωτηρίου

Attention here focuses on the deviation in the versions regarding the number of 'burnt offerings', the only phenomenon which is not inner-Greek related. 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 has the plural עֹלֹת/ὀλοκαυτώματα; MT 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2 has the singular עֹלָה(י); and LXX 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2 has the plural τὰς ὀλοκαυτώσεις/τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα.⁶¹⁴ Majority opinion is that the singular forms of עֹלָה in MT 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2 are collective and that the plural forms in the parallel Greek texts are the result of attraction to the plural forms in the previous verse. McCarter, however, believes that the plural form is original in MT 2 Sam. 6.18, but he does not offer any evidence in support of his view.⁶¹⁵ One piece of evidence which favours McCarter's view is the distinctive lexemes for 'burnt offerings' in Greek Samuel, ὀλοκαυτώματα in v. 17 and (τὰς) ὀλοκαυτώσεις in v. 18, which argues against the view that the latter was assimilated to the former. Apart from the relationship of 'burnt offerings' in 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1 to 'burnt offering(s)' in 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2, one must assume either that the development occurred independently in Samuel and Chronicles or that the change was made first in one book followed by a change in the other. Considering all possibilities, it seems most probable that an earlier plural form in Samuel was altered to the singular and that Chronicles was updated on the basis of Samuel. The noun עֹלָה occurs

⁶¹⁴ 'David' is spelt defectively in 2 Sam. 6.17-18 and plene in 1 Chron. 16.1-2, but 'burnt offering' is spelt plene and with variation in both verses of Samuel (עֹלֹת; הַעֹלָה), and plene in 1 Chron. 16.1 (עֹלָה) but defectively in 1 Chron. 16.2 (הַעֹלָה). See appendix 3.

⁶¹⁵ McCarter 1984: 167.

286 times in the Bible but only 67 times as a plural, including six times in Samuel and twenty times in Chronicles. In general, the singular form is the conventional form, used as an absolute, collective or abstract singular. A detailed look at עלה in Samuel and Chronicles reveals that context often indicates whether more than one sacrificer, animal or occasion is in view, apart from whether the singular or plural form is used. On a number of occasions, however, the singular form is used in Samuel (five times) and Chronicles (thirteen times) when the number of sacrifices is difficult to pinpoint. Is the singular form a 'true' singular (one עלה), a 'collective' singular (one עלה standing for multiple עלות) or 'abstract' singular (one עלה for the concept of עלה in general)? These passages in Samuel are 1 Sam. 13.9 (twice), 10, 12 and 2 Sam. 6.18, and this distribution seems beyond coincidence. See below.

Along with זבח (the basic term for 'sacrifice'), the nouns עלה ('burnt offering') and שלם ('peace/fellowship offering') are most common in Samuel and Chronicles.⁶¹⁶ Of the main types of sacrifices, meaning those oblations which are wholly or partly burned at the altar, and in addition to עלה and שלם, Samuel, but not Chronicles, has אשם ('guilt/reparation offering'), and Chronicles, but not Samuel, has חטאת ('sin/purification offering') and מנחה (as 'cereal/grain offering', not as 'gift, tribute, offering' in general, which occurs in both Samuel and Chronicles).

HALOT says the עלה is 'probably [an] abbreviation for מִנְחָה עֹלָה "tribute rising (in the fire)" and means 'sacrifice which is wholly burned, comprising domestic animals and occasionally birds'.⁶¹⁷ The עלה was the only Israelite sacrifice to be *wholly* (except for the skin) rather than partially burned and distributed for consumption. Primarily according to 'P', the עלה is 'a gift for "an aroma pleasing to Yahweh"', and serves (1) as a thank (תודה),

⁶¹⁶ It is impossible and unnecessary to address the large number of biblical terms for sacrifices and offerings, the meaning of each term, and the persons, places, occasions, materials and ritual processes associated with each of them.

⁶¹⁷ *HALOT* II, 830.

votive (נדר) or freewill (נדבה) offering; (2) as a part of prayer and supplication; (3) as a part of the daily, weekly, and monthly, and festival cultic pattern in the sanctuary cult; and (4) to make atonement either alone or in combination with the grain offering, but especially with the sin offering.⁶¹⁸ In essence, the עלה is the sacrifice that constitutes the basic nourishment for the deity.⁶¹⁹

The noun שלם occurs 87 times: 53 times in Exodus–Numbers, 17 times in Joshua–Kings, eight times in Chronicles, and nine times in other books. The term has puzzled translators and commentators from antiquity to the present day, but this is not the place to discuss issues such as the numerous and diverse renderings of the noun in English translations; the provenance and etymology of the noun; cognate nouns in Ugaritic, Akkadian, and Phoenician and Punic; explanations for the appearance of the noun in the plural only (שלמים) except in Amos 5.22; and the constructions or expressions in which the noun occurs. Regarding the latter, however, it should be pointed out that all but seven occurrences of שלם follow one of six patterns, of which three occur in Samuel and four in Chronicles. More specifically, the pattern 'singular עלה followed by שלמים' in a chain occurs ten times, including 1 Sam. 13.9; 2 Sam. 6.18; 1 Chron. 16.2; 2 Chron. 31.2; and the pattern 'plural עלות followed by שלמים' in a chain occurs eleven times, including 2 Sam. 6.17; 24.25; 1 Chron. 16.1; 21.26. Finally, (1) concerning עלות/עלה (and all other terms) together with שלמים in a chain, שלמים is always last in the list; and (2) according to Levine, עלות/עלה + שלמים is used as a merismus for the entire sacrificial system (e.g., Exod. 20.24).⁶²⁰

⁶¹⁸ Averbeck 1997: 1020–1021.

⁶¹⁹ G. A. Anderson 1992: 879.

⁶²⁰ Levine 1974: 21.

The *raison d'être* of שלם⁶²¹ is communion, and more specifically, the provision of victuals for communal celebration. As discussed above, whereas the עֹלָה was entirely (except for the skin) burned on the altar, only the fatty portions of the שלם were burned, while the remainder was distributed in part to the officiating priest but mostly to the person bringing the שלם.⁶²² The עֹלָה constituted the basic nourishment of the deity, whereas the שלם in turn nourished the people. This is the essence of the שלם sacrifice, but three other connotations are evident. (1) Joy. The שלם is especially appropriate to occasions of joy (Num. 10.10; Deut. 27.7). (2) Politics. The political function of the שלם sacrifice is evident in Enuma Elish and the Hebrew Bible. (3) Inauguration. Levine develops this association in his discussion of the historical development of the שלם sacrifice. He says:

The priesthood of Jerusalem sought to avail itself of a sacrifice identified with great cultic moments in Israelite history – the initiation of the monarchy under Saul, sanctioned by a cultic convocation; the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem, marking the rise of that city to cultic pre-eminence, and the dedication of Solomon's temple. There was also the tradition of the *šelāmîm* offered at Sinai (Exodus 24:25), and its association by the Deuteronomist with the initiation of Yahwistic worship in Canaan (Deuteronomy 27:7). The *šelāmîm* epitomized significant beginnings ...⁶²³

Levine's suggestion is well taken. In addition, scholars pay unsatisfactory attention to the rhetoric of שלם in Samuel. The noun occurs six times in the book, and it is instructive to compare and contrast (a) 1 Sam. 11.15, and (b) 1 Sam. 10.8; 13.9, with (c) 2 Sam. 6.17, 18; 24.25. This topic must be developed in another context. The following comments suffice for now. 1 Sam. 11.15. Apart from many occurrences of שלם in the cultic legislation of Exodus–Numbers, where isolated discussion of the individual types of offerings and sacrifices is to be expected, שלם is *repeatedly* accompanied in context by

⁶²¹ In addition to the lexica see G. A. Anderson 1987: 36-53; 1991: 19-57; 1992: 879; Levine 1974: 3-52, 118-122; Milgrom 1991: 217-225; Seow 1989: 131-132.

⁶²² The notion of the distributed portion will be taken up again in 5.1.3.8.

⁶²³ Levine 1974: 52.

offerings, except in Prov. 7.14; 1 Sam. 11.15; and 2 Chron. 30.22; 33.16. 1 Sam. 11.14-15 presents the so-called 'renewal' of Saul's kingship. According to the story, Samuel and the people proceed to Gilgal where they 'make Saul king before Yahweh' and then 'sacrifice זבחים שלמים before Yahweh'. Why do they not sacrifice the עלה as well? In all of Levine's 'great cultic moments' or 'significant beginnings' (see above) both types of sacrifices are offered, except at the initiation of monarchy under Saul. Is this mere coincidence? Is it accidental as well that לפני יהוה occurs in context with the verbs העלה or הקרב or the nouns עלה or שלם in Samuel only in 1 Sam. 11.15 and 2 Sam. 6.17 (see above)? In 1 Sam. 11.15, שלמים are offered (an act not attributed to Saul *alone*) 'before Yahweh' at a moment of great celebration in Israel, but the עלות which served primarily *for the deity* rather than for the people (= שלמים) are absent, ironically. 1 Sam. 10.8; 13.9. 1 Sam. 13.9 and 2 Sam. 6.17, 18 share the themes of עלה and שלם, but there is also some similarity related to ברכ, since both Saul and David are said to give a blessing in these passages (1 Sam. 13.10 and 2 Sam. 6.18, 20).⁶²⁴ In 1 Samuel 13, Saul completes an עלה sacrifice (ויחי ככלתו להעלות העלה) and then goes out to meet (לקראתו) Samuel and 'bless' him (לברכו), but he is rebuked by Samuel for his disobedience. In 2 Samuel 6, David completes עלה and שלם sacrifices (ויכל דוד מהעלות העולה והשלמים) and then blesses (ויברך) the people, before he returns to bless (לברך) his house, but on his way David is met (לקראת) by Saul's daughter Michal, who rebukes David. It cannot be coincidental that כלה + מ/להעלות ('finish offering') occurs in the Bible in three passages only: 1 Sam. 13.10; 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2; and 2 Chron. 29.29. To add to the ironic presentation of these kingly figures, 1 Sam. 13.9-10, 12 is the only passage in the Bible where עלה and שלם sacrifices are planned, but only the former is completed. In the case of Saul, the cultic activity *for* him and *by* him is incomplete; and Saul's attempted sacrifice to Yahweh was

⁶²⁴ See 5.1.3.9 and 5.1.3.10.

incomplete in another way as well, since it is not, after all, לפני יהוה. Saul tries his hand at sacrifice when the situation around him spins out of control. David, however, does sacrifice in 2 Samuel 6 following several great successes. In addition to 1 Sam. 10.8 and 13.9-10, 12, Saul involves himself in sacrifice in two other passages. Saul's cultic activity in 1 Sam. 14.32-34 is sometimes viewed as licit. However, the chapter as a whole is strongly anti-Saul: '... all the glory accrues to Jonathan, and Saul is made to look ridiculous'; 'Saul's loss is Jonathan's gain. His resolution and prompt action, attended by signs of divine approval, are in sharp contrast to Saul's hesitation and fumbling after divine guidance'.⁶²⁵ Saul is neither military nor religious leader. David is both. In 1 Sam. 15.15, 21-22, Saul's illicit cultic activity results in his rejection as king. No so with David. To conclude, Hawk reads Saul's story in 1 Samuel as a tragedy-like drama in four acts that hinges on the *leitmotif* of sacrifice.⁶²⁶ Indeed, Saul's endeavours and David's achievements in this regard accentuate the dissimilarities between the two kings.

It is vital to address the placement of שלמים in Samuel's object clause with the former discussion in mind. MT Samuel's word order is reflected in all versions of Samuel except for Peshitta Samuel, which looks like Chronicles. The placement of the שלם sacrifices in 4QSam^a is uncertain. Many regard the separation of שלמים from עלות in 2 Sam. 6.17 as an indication that שלמים is a late addition to the story, probably on the basis of שלמים in 2 Sam. 6.18, and perhaps analogous to the occurrence of שלמים in 1 Sam. 13.9, and they consider the placement of שלמים adjacent to עלות in 1 Chron. 16.1 a stylistic adjustment of the awkward syntax of the *Vorlage*. Jackson does not favour this opinion regarding Samuel, arguing that if שלמים were a late addition, then based on its attestation in Greek Samuel, it would have to be very ancient, to say the least.⁶²⁷ However, this said,

⁶²⁵ Jobling 1998: 94, 95; cf. V. P. Long 1989: 41.

⁶²⁶ Hawk 1996.

⁶²⁷ Jackson 1962: 106, 188.

Samuel's syntax may reflect scribal editing posterior to the original composition of the Hebrew versions of Samuel and Chronicles, but antecedent to their translation. Clearly, the conventional word order in Chronicles could be an intentional emendment, but could the inelegant word order in Samuel be an intentional accent to the story? This is the view of Fokkelman ('epiphora') and Murray ('prominence').⁶²⁸ This case of hyperbaton or transposition is an attempt by Samuel's editors to accentuate David's offering of שלמים in contrast with Saul's failed attempt (see above): 'and David offered up עלות *before Yahweh*—and שלמים *too!*'.

The identification (and its significance) of the agent(s) of the sacrifices in 2 Sam. 6.13, 17-18 and 1 Chron. 15.26; 16.1-2 is perhaps the hottest issue in this material. Did David carry out the sacrifices or did others do so on his behalf? The broader issues which this material raises are (1) how sacrificial activity by David should be construed in view of sacrificial prerogative in priestly literature and (2) whether Chronicles intends to attenuate an 'inappropriate' assertion in Samuel. This section focuses on the second issue.

Most believe David alone makes the sacrifices in 2 Sam. 6.13 whereas the Levites, and in all probability apart from David's participation, make the sacrifices in 1 Chron. 15.26.⁶²⁹ No subject for the verb זבח is explicitly mentioned in either text (unless the same זרוע also attend to the sacrifices in Chronicles) but very few think the verb is impersonal⁶³⁰ in either text or that it is factitive⁶³¹ in Samuel. However, the clause (καὶ θύματα ['and a sacrifice']) is impersonal in Greek Samuel, in the first instance (v. 12) in OL Samuel, and in Jacob's version of Samuel. This textual and literary 'neutrality' may be the

⁶²⁸ Fokkelman 1990: 197 n. 98; Murray 1998: 64, 138. Murray points to the rhetorical placement of זרוע in Gen. 13.15; 28.13.

⁶²⁹ Some try to harmonise the discrepancies in the two accounts by claiming, e.g., that David makes the smaller sacrifice (in Samuel) and (he and) 'the elders' make the larger sacrifice (in Chronicles).

⁶³⁰ French *on* or German *man*.

⁶³¹ That is, David is the person who authorises the sacrifices and on whose behalf they are offered, but he himself does not make them.

clue to tracking the developments in the texts. It should be considered whether later editors independently and tendentiously adjusted the *Vorlage* according to a royal-sacral thrust in Samuel and a corporate-levitical thrust in Chronicles.

Scholars hold similar perspectives on the concluding sacrifices in 2 Sam. 6.17 // 1 Chron. 16.1. Most think Chronicles verb form seeks to attribute the sacrifices to priestly attendants, or conversely stated, to attenuate David's sacerdotal activity. However, in this case, most scholars seem unaware that in the following verse Chronicles *does* attribute the sacrifices to David, or at least some of them. Those calling attention to this 'discrepancy' suggest either that the verb is factitive or that the Chronicler was careless or misunderstood his *Vorlage*. First, Japhet says 'Although the king assumes responsibility for the cult and initiates change or activity, he is excluded from any direct part in the ritual itself'.⁶³² Consequently, the Chronicler 'rework[s]' and 'qualif[ies]' and 'limit[s]' his sources, but his methodology is 'incomplete' and 'inconsistent'.⁶³³ To the contrary, there are only five synoptic passages relating a king's (licit) participation in cultic activity (using זבח, העלה, הקריב):

- David in (1) 2 Sam. 6.13, 17-18 // 1 Chron. 15.26; 16.1-2; (2) 2 Sam. 24.18-25 // 1 Chron. 21.18-26.
- Solomon in (3) 1 Kgs. 8.5, 62-64 // 2 Chron. 5.6; 7.4-5, 7; (4) 1 Kgs. 9.25 // 2 Chron. 8.12; (5) 1 Kgs. 10.5 // 2 Chron. 9.4.

In view of the paucity of related material in his *Vorlage*, and in view of his ideological bent, it is doubtful that the Chronicler is guilty of such oversights and shortcomings.

Second, De Vries thinks the Chronicler misunderstood his *Vorlage*:

Rather than suppose a theological quirk in allowing the congregation to sacrifice ... it is better to assume that ChrH [the historian, not the redactor] misunderstands the verb *wayēkal* as seen in the Samuel *Vorlage*. There it functions as a transition from the actual sacrificing, 2 Sam 6:17b, and the blessing of the people that follows. The sentence has a resumptive quality that escapes ChrH's understanding,

⁶³² Japhet 1997: 441-442.

⁶³³ Japhet 1997: 442-444; cf. Brettler 1995: 33-34.

and he assumes that the congregation first had to sacrifice in order for David to 'complete' the process. All the same, the absence of priests and Levites at this point is an odd deficiency, and can be accounted for only on the supposition that their participation would have been assumed. It is to be assumed, furthermore, that in ChrH's mind the people and David did not perform the actual ritual, but presented the victims to the proper, unnamed officiants.⁶³⁴

This is a novel yet unsustainable interpretation. First, the claim that $\text{כלה} + \text{מ/ל} + \text{infinitive}$ is used with the meaning 'finish off/up what somebody else began' is unsubstantiated. Second, how could the Chronicler have misunderstood the alleged Samuel *Vorlage*? Samuel portrays David as the person making the sacrifices in v. 16, and the repetition in v. 17 serves to *intensify* the view that David himself was the agent.⁶³⁵ Yes, the repetition functions as a transition, as De Vries claims, but its aim is more pointedly *intensification*. The text could very well have said $\text{ויעל דוד עלות לפני יהוה ושלמים ויברך אתהעם בשם יהוה}$ צבאות , in which case the verb sequence consisting of two *wayyiqtol* forms would have left no ambiguity concerning the sequence of events: David sacrificed and [then] David blessed. De Vries *assumes* that in reality (a) David did not sacrifice and (b) the repetition is merely transitional or resumptive. The text of Samuel, however, disfavours both these assumptions. Rather, it says: 'And David sacrificed burnt offerings before Yahweh, and peace offerings [too]. And David finished sacrificing the burnt offerings and peace offerings, and he blessed the people in the name of Yahweh of armies/hosts'.

Three additional points substantiate the claim that the verb form in Chronicles does not aim to attenuate David's 'priestly' activity in this story. First, David's dress in an ephod (2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27), his blessing of the people בשם יהוה (2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2), and perhaps his distribution of foodstuff (2 Sam. 6.19 // 1 Chron. 16.3), carry cultic implications. See below. Second, David's priestly role as sacrificer is not altered in 1 Chron. 21.26 (// 2 Sam. 24.25), and Chronicles independently augments it in 1

⁶³⁴ De Vries 1989: 148.

⁶³⁵ Bressan 1960: 529.

Chron. 21.28. To the contrary, Hoglund says David is the only royal figure the Chronicler portrays positively when he acts in a priestly manner⁶³⁶, although Solomon should also be included. Third, David's sons are called 'priests' in MT 2 Sam. 8.18, but not in the OG nor in 1 Chron. 18.17. In the past, the difference between the received versions was usually attributed to Chronicles' unwillingness to accept that non-Levites could be or act as priests, but recently the view that סכנים stood in Chronicles' *Vorlage* and that MT Samuel's כהנים is a subsequent 'corruption' has become fashionable.⁶³⁷ But is MT Samuel's כהנים an unintentional corruption or an *intentional appointment*, precisely related to MT Samuel's focus on David's priestly duties?

5.1.3.6	2 Sam. 6.14 1 Chron. 15.27	ודוד מכרכר בכל־עו לפני יהוה // ודוד מכרבל במעיל בויג וכל־הלויים הנשאים את־הארון והמשררים וכנניה השר המשא המשררים
---------	-------------------------------	--

The material summarised in 5.1.3.6 and 5.1.3.7 demands a full chapter for a comprehensive presentation; accordingly much primary and secondary evidence is excluded. Few acknowledge the full extent of the textual and theological difficulties in 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27. 2 Sam. 6.14 shares (1) either the theme of dance with vv. 5, 16, 21 (and perhaps 20b) or the theme of music and song with vv. 5, 15 (one's answer depends on the interpretation of מכרכר); (2) the theme of attire with v. 20; (3) לפני יהוה with vv. 5, 16, 17, 21; (4) and possibly בכל־עו with v. 5. Chronicles addresses David's attire in 1 Chron. 15.27 only, and then twice as an *inclusio* or *doublet* (אפוד בד; במעיל בויג); but the themes of music and song (also shared with 2 Sam. 6.5, 15) and religious attendants (i.e., priests and Levites) appear in chapter 13 and dominate chapters 15–16. The grammar of the clauses with מכרכר and מכרבל is circumstantial. See 5.0.

⁶³⁶ Hoglund 1999: 517.
⁶³⁷ Japhet 1993: 352; Williamson 1982: 140; also Wenham 1975.

Working backwards, Chronicles' plus, which reports that the Levites, the singers, and Chenaniah, the director of music, also wear linen robes (מעילים בוצים), is considered by Keil and Delitzsch as original to the common source used by Samuel and Chronicles⁶³⁸, but others rightly conclude that the Chronicler or a subsequent editor is responsible for this material. The writer must pass by the variation in the spelling of the proper name and the elliptical grammar in MT and LXX^L and simply put forth the suggestion which must be argued elsewhere that the grammar of המשא and המשררים indicates that these words are glosses on an original וכןניח השר: 'and Chenaniah is השר'. Of what? Of המשא (as in 15.22). Of what? (המשא by itself can refer to the lifting of music or the ark.) Of המשררים. The original supplement had '... as also were the Levites, i.e., the carriers of the ark, and the singers, and Chenaniah, i.e., the leader [in the matter of lifting the ark]'. Moving on, Samuel situates David 'before Yahweh'. One should hesitate to agree with Curtis and Madsen that the change from מכרכר to מכרב is 'intentional, as the omission of לפני יהוה would show'.⁶³⁹ Regarding Samuel's בכל-עו it is argued in 3.1.4.2 that 2 Sam. 6.5's ברושים עצי בכל is probably secondary to 4QSam^a's and 1 Chron. 13.8's עו בכל and ובשירים.

The versions attest five textual and interpretative traditions for the main activity in the first clause of 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27.

- Dancing (a dance). This tradition is attested in MT Samuel and 4QSam^a according to the majority interpretation of מכרכר, and it is also evident in the Vulgate of Samuel.
- Wearing (certain attire). This tradition is supported by all versions of Chronicles.
- Praising (in general). This tradition is attested in the Targum and Peshitta of Samuel.⁶⁴⁰

⁶³⁸ Keil and Delitzsch 1872: 206-208.

⁶³⁹ Curtis and Madsen 1910: 219. See 3.1.4.1 and appendix 2.

⁶⁴⁰ Did the Targum influence the Peshitta (Englert 1949: 74)?

- Playing (musical instruments). This tradition is attested in MT Samuel and 4QSam^a according to the minority interpretation of מכרך, and it is the tradition reflected in the LXX and OL of Samuel as well as in Josephus.⁶⁴¹ In addition, Midrash Rabbah on Numbers 4.20 transmits this understanding.
- Praising (in general) and playing (musical instruments). Jacob of Edessa combines the alternative traditions preserved in the Peshitta and Septuagint.

MT Samuel. The verb מכרך (pilpel of כרך) in MT Samuel and 4QSam^a has elicited much debate. The root's essence is 'to be round', and the occurrences in 2 Samuel 6 are rendered as

- 'Play' or 'dance', in general
- 'Gallop, hop, jump, leap, prance, skip, spring', a vertical movement
- 'Circle, pirouette, revolve, rotate, spin, turn, turn round, twist, whirl, whirl round, writhe', a circular movement
- 'Clap' or 'snap' or 'finger, strum' or 'intertwine, twirl, twist, twiddle', an activity of the hands or fingers

The verb מכרך occurs in biblical Hebrew in 2 Sam. 6.14, 16 only, but it is used more frequently in post-biblical Aramaic and Hebrew, and cognate roots are attested in Arabic, Coptic, Ethiopic and Ugaritic. The single occurrence of the verb in Ugaritic, in El's response to Athirat in the Baal Cycle (*KTU* 1.4 IV 29) is particularly significant since *wykrkr uṣḇṯh* is clearly an activity done with the fingers, as recognised also by translators and lexicographers.

Most translations and commentaries assume the conventional interpretation of מכרך, 'dance'. The Bible has a rich assortment of terminology for dance, but the basic terminology for human dancing is the verbs דוץ, דלג, חול, כרך, פוז, קפץ, רקד and שחק and the nouns מחול and מחולה.⁶⁴² The subjects of dance in biblical literature are Israelites or other

⁶⁴¹ The OL has *percutiebat in organis et armigatis*. Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 7.85 has αὐτοῦ δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς παίζοντος καὶ κροτοῦντος. It is impossible to address the details here.

⁶⁴² Gruber 1981 discusses some of this terminology.

people in general, and often women, but as far as this writer can determine the only named 'dancers' in the Bible are Miriam and David. Focusing on Samuel and Chronicles, and considering the total range of vocabulary for the dance activity of people, one finds that dance occurs only in context with David's activities:

- 1 Sam. 18.6-7; 21.12; 29.5, for the dance of Israelite women upon the return of David and Israel after war with the Philistines.
- 1 Sam. 30.16, for the dance of the Amalekites after pillaging Ziklag and prior to their defeat by David and Israel.
- 2 Sam. 6.5, 14 (?), 16, 21 // 1 Chron. 13.8; 15.29, for the dance of David (and the Israelites in 6.5 // 13.8) upon transferring the ark.

Dance in Chronicles occurs in shared material only, and the book's references are doubly remarkable due to dissimilar terminology and to the Chronicler's (independent) interest in music and song elsewhere.

Dance in the ancient orient was usually done by women. Israel's corporate joy was commonly expressed in great celebration, accompanied by music, song and dance, often with additional adjuncts such as thanksgiving, offerings, food and drink. Dance embodies happiness and gratitude and has complemented personal, political and religious occasions and triumphs from time immemorial. It generally accompanied military victories, royal processions, and religious celebrations, as well as other significant rites of passage such as marriage and mourning. Dance is associated with Yahweh's cult in Ps. 30.12; 87.7; 149.3; 150.4, and with cultic activity in Exod. 32.19 and 1 Kgs. 18.26. Accordingly, some believe מִכְרָכַר in 2 Sam. 6.14, 16 is (positively) some form of sacred dance, or relates (negatively) to Canaanite ritual, or functions as a fertility rite or prelude to sacred marriage. Most, however, view David's מִכְרָכַר in 2 Sam. 6.14, 16 as simply an expression of joy without either the positive or negative associations just mentioned.

The Ugaritic cognate moves several scholars to abandon the meaning 'danced' for מִכְרַכַּר in 2 Sam. 6.14 in favour of an activity of the fingers or hands.⁶⁴³ If this is the 'primitive' meaning of מִכְרַכַּר it should not come as a surprise since

David's skills as a poet, musician, and sponsor of music were renowned ... His compositions in 2 Samuel and the Davidic psalms demonstrate a poetic genius. His sponsorship of, and involvement in, religious celebrations in connection with the ark show his musical talents and interests. We even read of 'instruments of David' that he created or that were somehow associated with him (2 Chr 29:26; Neh 12:36; cf. Amos 6:5).⁶⁴⁴

David's musical interest and talent are enlarged chiefly in Psalms⁶⁴⁵, in Ezra-Chronicles, and even more so in post-biblical literature. In Samuel, the Song of the Bow (2 Sam. 1.18-27) and the Song of Thanksgiving (2 Sam. 22.1-51) are attributed to him, and he is labelled 'Israel's pleasant/sweet psalmist/singer' (2 Sam. 23.1), but his activity as musician is limited to playing a stringed instrument in 1 Sam. 16.16-18, 23; 18.10; 19.9 (always with בִּיד ±; בַּכֹּנֹר ±; נָנָן).

MT Chronicles. All versions of Chronicles depict David wearing certain attire.

Scholars explain this tradition in eight ways:

- The change is a non-tendentious clarification/correction of an indistinct *Vorlage* (#1).
- The change is a non-tendentious modernisation of obsolete or uncommon terminology (#2).
- The change is a non-tendentious alteration based on the Chronicler's interest in describing the king's and priests' dress (#3).
- The change is a tendentious mitigation of the scandal of David's dress (אִפְדָּן/σδολή) which was indecently revealing (#4) ...
- or impertinently priestly. In these scenarios (#4–5) most believe the Chronicler altered the text to וְדָוִד מִכְרַכַּל בַּמַּעִיל and an editor subsequently appended וְעַל-בֵּד דָּוִד אִפְדָּן on the basis of Samuel (#5).

⁶⁴³ Avishur 1976, 1984: 719-723; McCarter 1984: 171; Murray 1998: 62-63. Gruber 1981: 338-340 entertains this view, and he also points out on the basis of ethno-archaeological evidence that the verb could mean *both* dancing and a gesture(s) of the hand(s) or fingers.

⁶⁴⁴ Howard 1992: 48.

⁶⁴⁵ Limburg 1992: 528.

- The change is a tendentious mitigation of the scandal of David's dance (#6).
- The change is a tendentious augmentation of the liturgical portrayal of David who exercised a priestly function as a priest-king (#7).
- Samuel and Chronicles each abridges a more complete account, from which each tradition has selected the material pertinent to its focus (#8).

Scholars disagree on whether the alteration is intentional or tendentious. Indeed, they reasonably express dissatisfaction with the notions of graphic confusion, modernisation, subsequent glossing on the basis of Samuel, and the so-called 'scandal' of David's dance, which after all *is* mentioned in 1 Chron. 13.8; 15.29.

'The frequent reference to dress or ornamentation indicates the social and symbolic importance of clothing for ancient Israelite society'.⁶⁴⁶ Clothing is worn for protection, aesthetics/status and ethics/religion. The main garments in the ancient world were the outer/over garments, inner/under garments, headgear, footwear, accessories and ornamentation.⁶⁴⁷ There are dozens of nouns for outer and inner garments and five main verbs for putting on clothes (כסה, לבש, עטה, עטף, צנף), and these occur relatively often in Samuel and less so in Chronicles. Chronicles and its synoptic parallels regularly agree on the issue of attire, and neither Samuel nor Chronicles reflects an interest in sacral dress. The special attire of Aaron and his sons is described in Exodus 28–29, 39 and Leviticus 8, but the only piece of priestly clothing mentioned outside 'P' is the ephod.⁶⁴⁸

The derivation of Chronicles' מכרבֵּל ('clothe, be-mantle, bind/wrap around') is uncertain, and it is also unclear, contra Japhet⁶⁴⁹, that the verb 'is a clear sign of Aramaic

⁶⁴⁶ Edwards 1992: 232.

⁶⁴⁷ Clothes in the ancient world were made from skin/hide/leather (goat, sheep), hair (goat, camel), wool (white, tan, grey, black), linen (flax) and cotton, and much less commonly from hemp, jute and silk. The principal colours of clothing were white, black, red/crimson/scarlet, blue and purple/violet.

⁶⁴⁸ Wright 1992: 241.

⁶⁴⁹ Japhet 1987: 12.

influence'.⁶⁵⁰ David's attire is described in MT and LXX 1 Chron. 15.27a, where he is dressed with a מעיל/στολή, and again in MT and LXX 2 Sam. 6.14b // 1 Chron. 15.27c, where he wears an אפוד/στολή. The noun מעיל occurs twenty-eight times, referring to an outer-garment ('coat, cloak, mantle, robe, outer/over-garment') which was wrapped and then belted or pinned over the inner-garment which was worn next to the skin. מעיל is used figuratively on four occasions, as a priestly garment ten times in Exodus and Leviticus, and fourteen times for the attire of a person of rank: Samuel (1 Sam. 2.19; 15.27; 28.14), Saul (1 Sam. 24.5, 12), Jonathan (1 Sam. 18.4), David (1 Chron. 15.27), Tamar (MT 2 Sam. 13.18), Ezra (Ezra 9.3, 5), Job (Job 1.20), Job's friends Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar (Job 2.12), and princes of the sea (Ezek. 26.16). It is reasonable to conclude that מעיל in 1 Chron. 15.27 (and also in 1 Sam. 2.19) should not be construed as sacral apart from an additional indicator in the context that this is so.⁶⁵¹ The adjective בוץ ('byssus') modifying מעיל is characterised as a late synonym of שש but this view is problematical.⁶⁵² The discussion of מעיל בוץ continues in 5.1.3.7.

5.1.3.7	2 Sam. 6.14	וידוד חגור אפוד בד //
	1 Chron. 15.27	ועל־דויד אפוד בד

This clause, and the phrase אפוד בד in particular, have received insufficient technical discussion. The textual evidence is:⁶⁵³

⁶⁵⁰ See appendix 3.
⁶⁵¹ Johnstone 1997: I, 188 thinks מעיל is a pun on מעל (cf. 1 Chron. 10.13), presumably for contrast, and this may be so even though the two terms are etymologically and semantically distinct.
⁶⁵² See appendix 3.
⁶⁵³ Josephus lacks this clause.

	Verb/Preposition Phrase	Ephod	Robe Etc.	Byssus	Linen	Other
S: Pesh.	וּלְבַשׁ אֶת-דָּוִד	אֶפֶד		זָבִיבָה		
C: Pesh.	לְבַשׁ אֶת-דָּוִד	אֶפֶד		זָבִיבָה		
C: Symm.	καὶ ἐπὶ Δαυεῖδ	ἐπωμίς		βυσσίνη		
S: MT	וַיִּקְוֶה	אֶפֶד			בָּד	
S: 4QSam ^a	וַיִּדְוֶה	אֶפֶד			בָּד	
S: Vulg.	<i>porro David erat accinctus</i>	<i>ephod</i>			<i>lineo</i>	
C: MT	וַעֲלֶה־בָּד	אֶפֶד			בָּד	
C: OL	<i>David autem etiam indutus erat</i>	<i>ephod</i>			<i>lineo</i>	
C: Vulg.	<i>David autem indutus erat etiam</i>	<i>ephod</i>			<i>lineo</i>	
C: LXX ^L	καὶ ἐπὶ Δαυίδ	ἐφούδ				μόνον
C: Theod.	καὶ ἐπὶ Δαβίδ	ἐφούδ				μόνον
S: Targ.	וַיִּדְוֶה אֶת-דָּוִד		כִּרְדוּשׁ	דְּבִינָה		
S: Jacob	וּלְבַשׁ אֶת-דָּוִד		אֶפֶד	זָבִיבָה		
C: Targ.	וַעֲלֶה דָוִד		כִּרְדוּשׁ	דְּבִינָה		
C: LXX ^A	καὶ ἐπὶ Δαυεῖδ		στολή	βυσσίνη		
C: LXX ^B	καὶ ἐπὶ Δαυεῖδ		στολή	βυσσίνη		
C: Aquila	καὶ ἐπὶ Δαυεῖδ		ἐπένδυμα	βυσσίνη		
S: Symm.	καὶ ὁ Δαυεῖδ ἐνδεδυκώς		ὑποδύτην (fort. ἐπενδύτην)		λινούν	
S: LXX ^A	καὶ ὁ Δαυεῖδ ἐνδεδυκώς		στολήν			ἑξαλλόν
S: LXX ^B	καὶ ὁ Δαυεῖδ ἐνδεδυκώς		στολήν			ἑξαλλόν
S: LXX ^L	καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνδεδυμένος		στολήν			ἑξαλλόν
S: Theod.	καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνδεδυμένος		στολήν			ἑξαλλόν
S: Aquila	καὶ ὁ Δαυεῖδ ἐνδεδυκώς		ἐπένδυμα			ἐξαίρετον
S: OL	<i>indutus erat</i>		<i>uesti/veste</i>			<i>regali optima</i>

The (original) impersonal construction lacking the proper name may have been adjusted to David in other witnesses.⁶⁵⁴ The passive construction with an accusative is unexceptional. However, the variation in the verb/preposition phrase is remarkable. Japhet thinks Chronicles avoids the phrase אֶפֶד חָגַר ('gird an ephod') since it is rare⁶⁵⁵, occurring only in 1 Sam. 2.18 and 2 Sam. 6.14, but other evidence suggests that here the verb חָגַר may be a revision. First, the authors and editors of Samuel 'like' the verb חָגַר and its cognates. Ten of a total forty-four occurrences of the verb are in Samuel⁶⁵⁶, whereas

⁶⁵⁴ McCarter 1984: 166.

⁶⁵⁵ Japhet 1987: 10.

⁶⁵⁶ 1 Sam 2.18; 17.39; 25.13 (three times); 2 Sam 3.31; 6.14; 20.8; 21.16; 22.46.

there are none in Chronicles, and Samuel also uses two of four cognates related to חגר (חגור and חגורה, but not חגור and מחגרת). Furthermore, the text of MT 2 Sam. 20.8 is disordered, but חגור appears secondary, and ויחגרו in MT 2 Sam. 22.46 is certainly secondary to ויחרגו in synoptic Ps. 18.46, as the context, parallelism and versions demonstrate. Second, ἐνδεδυσκῶς/ἐνδεδυσμένος in LXX 2 Sam. 6.14 indicates that the Greek translator had a form of לבש rather than חגר in his *Vorlage*. On one hand, the Septuagint reserves ἐνδύω for לבש in ninety-five of ninety-nine cases, including 1 Sam. 17.5, 38 and 2 Sam. 14.2. On the other hand, and excluding 2 Sam. 6.14, חגר and its less frequent synonyms (אור, אפר, שנס and חוק twice) are represented by ζώνω/ζυμνύω or a related cognate in 46 of 64 cases⁶⁵⁷, by στυφίγω twice, by one of ten other verbs due to special (including poetic) circumstances in eleven cases⁶⁵⁸, and five times the LXX has a minus.⁶⁵⁹

The nouns אפר and אפרה occur forty-nine and three times respectively, and the verb אפר ('put on tightly, put on the ephod') occurs twice in context with the substantive. Cognates are Akkadian *epattu* ('costly garment') and Ugaritic *'pd* ('garment'). In the Bible, אפר is associated with the high priest in 'P', the leader Gideon (Judg. 8.27), the priest of Micah (Judg. 17.5; 18.14, 17, 18, 20), the judge-prophet(-priest?) Samuel (1 Sam. 2.18, 28), 'Saul's' priest Ahijah (1 Sam. 14.3), 'David's' priests Ahimelech (1 Sam. 21.10; 22.18 [and other priests]) and Abiathar (1 Sam 23.6, 9; 30.7), and with David himself (2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27). The three main uses are:

- The ephod is an ornate high priestly garment (33 times), made of זהב תכלת and worn by the high priest in 'P'.
- The ephod is a simple (sacral? priestly?) garment (three times), made of בד, worn by Samuel (1 Sam. 2.18) and David (2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27).

⁶⁵⁷ E.g., 1 Sam. 2.4, 18; 17.39; 25.13; 2 Sam. 3.31; 20.8; 21.16.

⁶⁵⁸ E.g., 2 Sam. 22.40, 46.

⁶⁵⁹ E.g., twice in 1 Sam. 25.13.

- The ephod is a cultic or divinatory device (or garment?) (sixteen times), distinguished six times from מסכה, פסל and תרפים, made of זָהָב at least twice, made of בָּר once (MT 1 Sam. 22.18), carried in the hand seven times (1 Sam. 2.28; 14.3; 22.18; 23.6, 9; 30.7 [twice]), and appearing an equal number of times in cultic contexts which are either illicit and licit (the latter in 1 Sam. 2.28; 14.3; 21.10; 22.18; 23.6, 9; 30.7 [twice]).

This synopsis draws attention to the complicated use of 'ephod' in biblical literature.

Three matters are highly debated: First, is David's vesture (solely?) in an ephod the reason for Michal's rebuke? Second, is the simple ephod (#2) a priestly garment (as most commentators assume)? Third, is the divinatory ephod (#3) a garment, and what is its relationship to the simple ephod? The first issue is addressed in the next chapter. It is impossible within the scope of this thesis to convey the writer's thorough investigation of the second and third issues. Regarding the second question, Samuel's and David's ephods may be construed as priestly *in a canonical context* but based on the usage *in Samuel alone* they are not intended as such.⁶⁶⁰ The aim of the identical phraseology is literary—to correlate the two characters *in the literature*: Samuel is David-like, and David is Samuel-like, and both are unlike Saul. Regarding the third question, scholars approach this issue in three ways, but these approaches do not ease the awkward array of adjuncts associated with this usage of 'ephod'.⁶⁶¹ Rather, the peculiar usage of 'ephod' in Samuel is interconnected with the literary development of the conflict between David and Saul, and their relationships to 'ephod' and 'ark'.

The Greek translational evidence for אֶפֹד and מַעִיל is instructive. אֶפֹד is routinely rendered by ἐπωμῖς and ἐφούδ/ἐφώδ/ἐφώθ, but אֶפֹד is parallel to ἱερατεία in Hos. 3.4, and to στολή in 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27 only. מַעִיל is rendered by a number of

⁶⁶⁰ Cody 1969: 77-78; cf. 75-78; Phillips 1969; although Phillips' view that the ephod is 'a brief loin cloth suitable for young children' is certainly mistaken (Tidwell 1974).

⁶⁶¹ The brief comments on 1 Sam. 14.18 in 3.1.2.3 are a partial response to the 'substitution' view, first suggested by Moore 1895: 232-234 with reference to Judg. 8.27, and developed with reference to Samuel by W. R. Arnold 1917: 7-34, 122-141; followed by Ahlström 1984; Bartal 1981; P. R. Davies 1975, 1976; van der Toorn and Houtman 1994.

Greek terms, including διπλοῖς, ὑποδύτης/ἑπενδύτης, ἱμάτιον, ποδήρης and χιτῶν, but מַעִיל and στολή are parallel in Job 2.12 and 1 Chron. 15.27 only. στολή occurs 81 times in the Greek portions equivalent to the Hebrew Bible canon. The term characteristically (45 times) represents בגד (the most common term for garments in general), commonly in Exodus and Leviticus, and six times⁶⁶² stands for לבוש and five times⁶⁶³ for שָׂמַל. Elsewhere στολή represents one of nine other Hebrew words or a minus. στολή occurs in Greek Samuel in 2 Sam. 6.14 only, but appears six times in Greek Chronicles: twice in 1 Chron. 15.27 (מַעִיל, אֶפֶד), once in 2 Chron. 5.12 (MT minus), 2 Chron. 18.9 (בגד), 2 Chron. 23.13 (בגד) and 2 Chron. 34.22 (בגד). Translation equivalency and consistency suggest that στολή does not represent אֶפֶד in the *Vorlage* of either 2 Sam. 6.14 or 1 Chron. 15.27. Rather, the Greek translators had a more generic term, perhaps בגד, in their *Vorlagen*.

The table above shows that the versions attest the noun phrase in six combinations of readings:

- Ephod + byssus
- Ephod + linen
- Ephod + alone
- Robe + byssus
- Robe + linen
- Robe + special

The non-Hebrew versions differ greatly regarding the noun phrase. The following comments summarise a larger study. There are ten words for linen of which the most common in descending order of frequency are שש, בד, משור, פשת and בוץ. The noun בד occurs twenty-three times and refers to (1) priestly garments in 'P'; (2) Samuel's, the priests' and David's linen ephods in 1 Sam. 2.18; 22.18 (MT); 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27; and (3) the celestial 'men' clothed in linen in Ezek. 9.2, 3, 11; 10.2, 6, 7; Dan. 10.5;

⁶⁶² Three in Esther.

⁶⁶³ Four in Genesis.

12.6, 7. The nouns **בד** and **בִּגְדֵי** occur in the same book in Ezekiel and Chronicles only and they occur together in 1 Chron. 15.27 only. **בד** modifies **אֵפוֹד** in 1 Sam. 2.18; 22.18 (MT); 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27 only. It should not go unnoticed that **בד אֵפוֹד** links Samuel, the priests of Nob, and David in these three passages in the *MT*, but this connection is absent from Greek Samuel's ἐφοῦδ βάρ (LXX^B et al.)/ἐφοῦδ (LXX^L), ἐφοῦδ and στολήν ἑξάλλου, respectively. Fokkelman and Polzin capitalise on the literary significance of **בד אֵפוֹד** in Samuel.⁶⁶⁴

Some suggest that the retention of **אֵפוֹד** alongside **מַעֲלֵל** reflects the Chronicler's carelessness or peculiar methodology, while others harmonise the two versions, believing David *really did* wear both, and still others suggest that in the Chronicler's era both garments were actually one and the same. Most who think the Chronicler tendentiously mitigated the scandal of David's dress, which was either indecently revealing or impertinently priestly, a mitigation which the Chronicler accomplished by dressing David with a **מַעֲלֵל** rather than an **אֵפוֹד**, also think a subsequent editor appended **בד ועל־דֹּוֹד אֵפוֹד** in Chronicles on the basis of Samuel. The following scenario may account best for the evidence. The earliest form of the text portrayed David playing an instrument (**מַכְרֵכֵר**) and made a more 'neutral' reference to David's attire, probably using **בִּגְדֵי**. In Samuel, the verb **מַכְרֵכֵר** was reinterpreted as 'dance' and the reference to David's outfit was adjusted to include an **אֵפוֹד** as part of the pro-David polemic. In Chronicles, related to the book's interest in describing the dress of the king and priests, the verb **מַכְרֵכֵר** was transformed to **מַכְרֵבֵל** and the reference to David's clothing was incorporated into *this same statement*. At a later stage in the development of the text the revised **אֵפוֹד**-clause in Samuel was integrated into Chronicles thus creating a doublet with regard to David's dress.

⁶⁶⁴ Polzin 1989: 42, 45, 234; Fokkelman 1990: 123-124.

5.1.3.8 2 Sam. 6.19 ויחלק לכל־העם לכל־המון ישראל למאִיש ועד־אשה לאִיש
חלת לחם אחת ואשפר אחד ואִשישה אחת //
1 Chron. 16.3 ויחלק לכל־אִיש ישראל מאִיש ועד־אשה לאִיש ככר־לחם ואשפר ואִשישה

The 'banquet' or 'feast' in 2 Sam. 6.19 // 1 Chron. 16.3 appropriately follows the themes of festivity (dance, music and song, jubilation) and cult (attire [?], sacrifice, blessing) in 2 Sam. 6.13-15, 17-18 // 1 Chron. 15.26-28; 16.1-2. This section focuses on textual variation related to the expression of the direct and indirect objects. The broader query concerns the reason for David's distribution of foodstuff.

The meaning and use of the verb חלק and the corresponding versional evidence are unremarkable. In general, the verb's meaning emphasises distribution (among partners) rather than the dividing procedure (into portions). Possible literary connections are discussed below.

The wordy triple, quadruple and quintuple indirect object is generally shorter in Chronicles and longer in Samuel, and within this partition, shorter in the MT and Targum texts and longer in the Greek and Latin versions. Josephus and the Peshitta of Chronicles each has a unique reference. Jacob's version of Samuel reflects close affinity to Greek Samuel. The readings in the Peshitta versions of Samuel and Chronicles are interesting since they are similar except for the extension in the Peshitta of Chronicles. Each version contains from three to five of the seven distinct phrases which are attested overall, and this diversity makes it impossible to lay out and explain each phrase and each arrangement of phrases in the body of this thesis.⁶⁶⁵

The consensus on the present material is that the Chronicler deleted לכל־העם, altered המון to איש, and simplified the compound preposition in למאיש to מאיש. Although he retained the distributive idea, the Chronicler supposedly economised on the pretentious details of his Samuel *Vorlage*, which were not pertinent to the message of his story.

⁶⁶⁵ Appendix 1 enlarges this discussion.

First, on כלהעם see 3.1.3.3 and appendix 1. העם appears in the immediately preceding 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2 and כלהעם is found in the immediately following 2 Sam. 6.19b // 1 Chron. 16.43a. In addition, non-synoptic Chronicles has כלהעם elsewhere in the immediate context (1 Chron. 13.4; 16.36, 43), and with the same referent as in 2 Sam. 6.19a // 1 Chron. 16.3. Finally, Samuel's liking for כלהעם, and the use of the phrase in synoptic material, suggest that the phrase was added in Samuel rather than omitted from Chronicles.

Second, the second phrase is attested as לכל־המון ישראל in MT Samuel (cf. the Targum, Peshitta, Jacob) but rather as לכל־איש ישראל in MT Chronicles (cf. the Targum, LXX). Conversely, the Peshitta of Chronicles has 'to all (those of) the house of Israel' and LXX Samuel has 'to the entire army of Israel'. The noun המון is used as

- 'Din, murmur, noise, roar, rush, sound' (#1)
- 'Agitation, bustle, commotion, confusion, tumult, turmoil' (#2)
- 'Crowd, multitude' (#3)
- 'Abundance, great number, wealth' (#4)

The noun's distribution and usage in Samuel are noteworthy. In 1 Sam. 4.14 (#1), Samuel asks about Israel's המון upon the Philistine's capture of the ark, and Polzin points out that the sound of Israel crying (קול ההמון) in 1 Sam. 4.14 becomes the blessed Israelite multitude (המון) in 2 Sam. 6.19.⁶⁶⁶ In 1 Sam. 14.16 (#3), 19 (#2), the narrator refers to the Philistines' המון upon Jonathan's success against them. In 2 Sam. 18.29 (#2), the messenger informs David of Israel's המון related to the execution of Absalom. In 2 Sam. 6.19 (#3), המון refers to the people who received gifts from David upon his successful transfer of the ark (and after his victory over the Philistines too). In view of the textual instability here, and the use of המון in the book, it is suggested that המון is a programmatic

⁶⁶⁶ Polzin 1991: 264; cf. 1989: 68-71, esp. 69.

modification intended to inflate still more the character and achievements of David. Gain, not loss. Success, not failure. David, like Jonathan, unlike Saul and Absalom.

A review of δύναμις in Greek Samuel suggests that the translator found either חיל or צבא in his *Vorlage*. This is the case nearly three-hundred times in the Bible, and is true for Samuel on more than two dozen occasions, *with the sole exception of 2 Sam. 6.19*. Overall, δύναμις corresponds to חמון only four times among the nearly four-hundred occurrences of δύναμις in the Greek version of the Hebrew canon, and although the writer has not investigated Jer. 3.23 and Ezek. 32.24, it is likely that the prophet's promise of delivery in MT 1 Kgs. 20.28 (LXX 21.29) was assimilated to the earlier promise in MT 1 Kgs. 20.13. From the reverse angle, the 83 occurrences of חמון are translated most frequently by a term related to 'multitude' (e.g., πληθος, ὄχλος), whereas terms related to 'noise' (e.g., ἦχος) are metonymies of cause (the crowd) for effect (their hustle and bustle, etc.).⁶⁶⁷

In view of these literary and text-critical observations, it is reasonable to suggest that the earliest of the attested readings was חיל or צבא. This terminology fits the context well, since the festivity in view follows both David's military victories over the Philistines (2 Sam. 5.17-25) and his retrieval of the sacred relic which they had plundered long ago (1 Samuel 4). Furthermore, יהוה צבאות is David's patron in 2 Sam. 5.10; 6.2, 18. It should also be mentioned that Murray thinks MT Samuel's כל-חמון ישראל is contextualised by כל-בחור בישראל in the first verse, i.e., the חמון is David's חיל or צבא.⁶⁶⁸ Regarding Chronicles, the book uses חמון ten times, in non-synoptic material, nearly as frequently as all the books of the Pentateuch and Former Prophets together (fourteen times), and usually with the meaning 'crowd, multitude'. Therefore, it is more likely that an original

⁶⁶⁷ ἰσχύς in Ezekiel (and once in Ps. 37.16) and πλοῦτος in Isaiah are idiosyncratic to these books.

⁶⁶⁸ Murray 1998: 138.

אִישׁ or צבא was polemicised in MT Samuel to הַמֶּלֶךְ and generalised in MT Chronicles to אִישׁ (on the basis of 1 Chron. 10.1, 7?) than that הַמֶּלֶךְ was altered to אִישׁ in Chronicles.

Third, the construction 'לְמִן ... (ו)עַד' is one member in a group of similar constructions expressing distributive 'from ... to', of which the most frequent in biblical literature is 'Y (ו)עַד ... X מִן', and in which X and Y may be (anarthrous or arthrous) nouns, adjectives, verbs or adverbs, though not necessarily identical in category in both the 'X מִן' and 'Y (ו)עַד' clauses. Many take the view⁶⁶⁹ that an original לְמִאִישׁ is simplified to מִאִישׁ in Chronicles. Conversely, Budde and Caspari excise *lamed* from Samuel.⁶⁷⁰ The textual evidence is disappointingly unhelpful except perhaps for the counter-evidence provided by three to ten medieval Hebrew manuscripts of Samuel and by the Syriac witnesses to Samuel. In spite of this, the following data cast some doubt on the consensus. The double preposition *lamed* + *min* (לְמִן) always governs a (anarthrous or arthrous) noun or adjective phrase, is followed by a complementary עַד (usually וְעַד; 'from ... [and] to ...') clause in about half its occurrences, and may designate temporal, spatial and personal data as well as physical age and moral or social status. The compound occurs 48 times, most often in Chronicles (ten times) followed by Jeremiah (seven times) and Samuel (six times total; four times in 2 Samuel 6–7). In non-synoptic material, לְמִן occurs twice in Samuel (2 Sam. 13.22; 19.25) and eight times in Chronicles (1 Chron. 5.9; 15.13; 27.23; 2 Chron. 15.13 [twice]; 25.5; 26.15; 30.3), and in synoptic material, Samuel and Chronicles share לְמִן twice (2 Sam. 7.11, 19 // 1 Chron. 17.10, 17) and twice Chronicles lacks the *lamed*, here and in 2 Sam. 7.6 // 1 Chron. 17.5. Observe that the identical phrase לְמִאִישׁ occurs in synoptic 2 Sam. 6.19 and in non-synoptic 2 Chron. 15.13. Finally, the use of אִישׁ and אִשָּׁה (side by side in singular or plural forms and in a variety of

⁶⁶⁹ Citing Driver 1890: 270.

⁶⁷⁰ Budde 1890: 231; Caspari 1924: 474.

constructions) as a merismus for 'people' is uncommon. In the present passage the phrase reveals the extraordinary nature of the occasion.⁶⁷¹

David's gift to the assembly of people consists of לחם, אשפר and אשישה. The versions have conjectures for obscure Hebrew terms; they do not attest alternate *Vorlagen*. The etymology and meaning of אשפר, which occurs only here, are uncertain. The noun is understood as

- 'Fruit cake', 'date cake', 'raisin cake', 'portion of dates', 'portion of raisins'
- 'Portion of (roast) meat' (related to שלם)
- 'Measure of wine' (related to שכר)

Most accept the first option, following Koehler, who argues for a connection with Arabic *sufrat*, meaning 'victuals', and more specifically, 'a traveller's provisions for a journey'.⁶⁷² The noun אשישה occurs five times (2 Sam. 6.19 // 1 Chron. 16.3; Isa. 16.7; Hos. 3.1; Cant. 2.5) and is interpreted as 'raisin-cake'. Scholars often point to (a) the delicacy of the food, evident in Isa. 16.7 and Cant. 2.5, or to (b) the cultic usage, evident in Hos. 3.1. The notions of delicacy and cult are not mutually exclusive. With respect to the cultic usage, scholars also mention that cakes are offered to the queen of heaven in Jer. 7.18; 44.19. Consequently, אשישה may have some connection to Canaanite fertility rites or a New Year's Festival, but the evidence is inadequate for drawing certain conclusions.

The received versions disagree on two points. First, the synonymous terms חלה and ככר precede לחם in Samuel and Chronicles, respectively. The etymology and physical shape of חלה-bread are obscure, but it is clear that the noun, which occurs a total of fourteen times in 2 Sam. 6.19 and elsewhere only in 'P'⁶⁷³, is a cultic term. Thus some suggest that here it was part of the שלם sacrifice which was subsequently distributed to the

⁶⁷¹ Halpern 2001: 333.

⁶⁷² Koehler 1948: 397-398; 1956: 15.

⁶⁷³ Exod. 29.2, 23; Lev. 2.4; 7.12 (twice), 13; 8.26 (twice); 24.5 (twice); Num 6.15, 19; 15.20.

people. The noun ככר occurs sixty-eight times in the Bible, most frequently in Chronicles (21 times), and means 'a round district, loaf or weight, i.e., talent'. The particular meaning 'a round of bread' occurs seven times, always as ככר לחם, in Exod. 29.23; Judg. 8.5; 1 Sam. 2.36; 10.3; Jer. 37.21; Prov. 6.26; 1 Chron. 16.3. It is uncertain whether the term refers to a portion ('some, piece, crust') or whole loaf of bread. Finally, the substitution of ככר for חלת may have been made in Chronicles, but the modification is neither an indication nor a result of chronological changes in biblical Hebrew.⁶⁷⁴ Second, the numerical adjective 'one' appears (1) three times in the MT, Targum, Peshitta and Jacob versions of Samuel, and in the Targum and Peshitta texts of Chronicles; (2) twice in the OL and Vulgate texts of Samuel; (3) once in LXX^{AB} Chronicles; and (4) is unattested in the LXX^{ABL}, Aquila and Symmachus texts of Samuel, in the MT, LXX^L, OL and Vulgate texts of Chronicles, and in Josephus. A detailed analysis of אחת/אחד and its representation in the versions verifies three points:

- The adjective is the cardinal 'one' rather than the indefinite 'a, a certain' in MT 2 Sam. 6.19.
- Greek Samuel consistently represents the adjective in the *Vorlage* so that it was probably not deleted from LXX 2 Sam. 6.19.
- The adjective occurs thirty-eight times in Chronicles and is absent in synoptic passages only here and in the description of the accessories for Solomon's temple (1 Kgs. 7.15, 17, 18, 38 // 2 Chron. 3.15, 16; 4.6).

The Chronicler did not remove the threefold enumeration in order to simplify the text or to eliminate extraneous information.⁶⁷⁵ Finally, Fokkelman points out the threefold occurrences of כל, the addressee⁶⁷⁶, and the enumeration of the distribution in 2 Sam. 6.19: 'the diversity of food is mirrored in a threefold enumeration which gives the

⁶⁷⁴ See appendix 3.

⁶⁷⁵ McCarter 1984: 167; Nysse 1984: 413-415.

⁶⁷⁶ In his opinion, לכל־המון ישראל defines לכל־העם. Rather, the addressee is fourfold in MT 2 Sam. 6.19.

numeral "one" a multiplicative significance in fact'.⁶⁷⁷ This may overstate the significance of the threefold occurrence of אֶחָד in MT 2 Sam. 6.19, which may simply be a stylistic addition.

The theme of food is ubiquitous in the Bible since food is essential for human existence. The ancient diet was broadly vegetarian. The ordinary food consisted of bread, olives and olive oil; milk, yoghurt, curds and cheese from flocks; and fruits, vegetables, legumes, nuts and herbs from wild and cultivated orchards and gardens. Meat was eaten only on rare occasions. Wine was the principal drink. Thus, the production of bread occupied a large part of the daily routine, and was produced according to a variety of preparations and forms. The principal grains were barley and wheat, mostly linked respectively to the poor and rich. The Bible contains more than a dozen nouns for 'disc/wafer' or 'cake/loaf' of 'bread/pastry' (including לֶחֶם) and four nouns describing wafers or cakes made with various types of fruit (including אֲשֵׁי־שֶׁה and אֲשַׁפֵּר).⁶⁷⁸ David's distribution did not consist of the standard daily fare, and food is often symbolic, as many recognise. What is the significance of David's distribution?

- General: (a) Expression of benevolence, generosity, hospitality, munificence, etc. (b) Expression of gratitude, thanksgiving, etc. (c) Demonstration of extravagance, pomp, etc.
- Political: Appeasement, foundation for good relations, alleviation of people's consternation, cause people to be well-disposed towards cultic innovation, etc.
- Religious: (a) Indication of divine presence, provision, fertility, etc.; (b) Enactment of divine-human communion, fellowship, reconciliation (cf. the שְׁלָמִים sacrifices). (c) Correlation of David with Melchizedek, the priest-king (cf. bread and wine in Gen. 14.18).
- Political-religious: Consecration or dedication of Jerusalem, related to the accession, entrance, coronation or enthronement of Yahweh, the divine warrior-king (cf. Ps. 68.19; 132.15; Canaanite [Baal] and Mesopotamian [Enuma Elish, Gudea Cylinder, Assurnasirpal, Shalmaneser] parallels).

⁶⁷⁷ Fokkelman 1990: 197-198.

⁶⁷⁸ The large quantity of related terminology does not require discussion here.

This writer cannot corroborate any of these reasons, but the fourth one is most implausible. From a literary perspective, David's חלק-activity may link 2 Samuel 6 with other stories in Samuel related to the distribution of spoil and gifts.⁶⁷⁹ These are: (1) Saul's rash vow and Jonathan's reprimand that the Israelites should enjoy the spoil of war against the Philistines (1 Sam. 14.24-46). (2) Saul's illicit acquirement of the spoil of war against the Amalekites (1 Sam. 15.1-34). (3) David's gift (vv. 11-12) to the Egyptian and his lavish distribution (vv. 26-31) of the spoil of war against the Amalekites (1 Sam. 30.1-31). With reference to Chronicles, the verb 'is to be highly typical of C's presentation of David's reign: David is the one who apportions not only supplies to his people as here but also rosters of duties to the priests and Levites (1 Chr 23:6)'.⁶⁸⁰

5.1.3.9	2 Sam. 6.18	וַיְבָרֶךְ אֶת־הָעָם בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת //
	1 Chron. 16.2	וַיְבָרֶךְ אֶת־הָעָם בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה

The versions differ only on צבאות, which is present in Samuel but not in Chronicles (except for the Peshitta of the latter). The evidence suggests that the epithet is a plus in Samuel in both 2 Sam. 6.2 (// 1 Chron. 13.6) and here (cf. 3.1.6.2). The phrase שם יהוה צבאות occurs only four times⁶⁸¹, and several point out that it is carefully woven into the structure of 2 Samuel 6, appearing at the start (v. 2) and finish (v. 18) of the ark's movements.

The deity's 'blessing' (ברך, ברכה) upon his 'people' (עם) is uncommon⁶⁸² and a person(s) blesses Yahweh's people even less frequently.

⁶⁷⁹ Murray 1998: 138 n. 84 observes that the verb חלק is used for the distribution of offerings only once elsewhere (Neh. 13.13). Caquot and de Robert 1994: 418 link 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Samuel 30. Outside 2 Sam. 6.19 in Samuel, חלק occurs in 1 Sam. 30.24 and 2 Sam. 19.30.

⁶⁸⁰ Johnstone 1997: I, 190; cf. 252.

⁶⁸¹ The only other occurrences are 1 Sam. 17.45 and Isa. 18.7. However, the three terms are closely associated elsewhere, e.g., 2 Sam. 7.26 // 1 Chron. 17.24.

⁶⁸² Num. 22.12; Deut. 26.15; 27.12; Josh. 17.14; Ps. 3.9; 29.11; 2 Chron. 31.10.

- Lev. 9.22-23. Moses and Aaron bless the people. Observe that the rare phrase העולה והשלמים in Lev. 9.22 occurs elsewhere in 1 Sam. 13.9 (see 5.1.3.5) and 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2.
- Josh. 8.33. The 'levitical priests' bless the people. This material falls in an MT plus.
- 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2. David blesses the people.
- 2 Chron. 30.27. The 'levitical priests' bless the people.
- 2 Chron. 31.8. Hezekiah and his officials bless the people.

In addition, 'to bless in Yahweh's name' is a right explicitly given to the priestly class in Num. 6.22-27 and Deut. 10.8; 21.5, and this privilege is exercised elsewhere only by Aaron (1 Chron. 23.13) and David (2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2). Some observe that Melchizedek blesses Abram (Gen. 14.19), Moses blesses the Israelites (Exod. 39.43; Lev. 9.23 [with Aaron]), and Eli blesses Elkanah and Hannah (1 Sam. 2.20), and these also assert that the only other king to mediate divine blessing is Solomon (1 Kgs. 8.14 // 2 Chron. 6.3), but Chronicles grants this privilege to Hezekiah too (2 Chron. 31.8).⁶⁸³ The foregoing comments permit two conclusions. First, David's blessing of the people in Yahweh's name is '*Priestly*' from a canonical perspective. Of course, scholars dispute whether the legislation in 'P' is antecedent or subsequent to the composition of the Davidic (and Solomonic) narratives. Second, Chronicles does not attenuate David's sacerdotal activity here, so that assertions that this was done elsewhere in the ark story should be met with suspicion.

⁶⁸³ The assertion that the Chronicler *tendentiously* omitted the second reference to Solomon's blessing (1 Kgs. 8.55) is equally questionable.

This material is uniform throughout the versions except for slight inner-versional differences in the Aramaic and Syriac texts and in Josephus.⁶⁸⁴

Murtonen believes בִּרְךְ should be rendered 'greet' in 2 Sam. 6.20 // 1 Chron. 16.43⁶⁸⁵, and both Alter and McCarter concur.⁶⁸⁶ It was common, and still is in some societies, to greet and bid farewell with a blessing. However, the translation 'greet' fails to do justice to בִּרְךְ's significance in this passage. Furthermore, the lexica give only a very few passages where 'greet' is appropriate⁶⁸⁷, and none includes 2 Sam. 6.20 // 1 Chron. 16.43.

The theme of blessing, discussed already at several points, is significant in Samuel⁶⁸⁸ and fundamental to the story of David's transfer of the ark.⁶⁸⁹ בִּרְךְ and הִלֵּךְ together form a concentric structure in 2 Sam. 6.11-20 // 1 Chron. 13.14; 15.25-28; 16.1-3, 43.⁶⁹⁰ Yahweh blesses (בִּרְךְ) Obed-edom and then David responds to Yahweh's blessing (בִּרְךְ) by going (הִלֵּךְ) to retrieve the ark (2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14; 2 Sam. 6.12). Yahweh's blessing inspires the second attempt to transfer the object and may be interpreted as a 'disguised' blessing upon David and the success of his enterprise. See 5.1.1. Upon the successful completion of this mission, David blesses (בִּרְךְ) the people of Israel (2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2) and then goes (הִלֵּךְ) to bless (בִּרְךְ) his own household

⁶⁸⁴ See 5.1.2.4 and appendix 3 on MT Samuel's וישב and MT Chronicles ויסב.

⁶⁸⁵ Murtonen 1959: 167.

⁶⁸⁶ Alter 1981: 124; McCarter 1984: 186.

⁶⁸⁷ Gen. 47.7; 1 Sam. 13.10; 1 Sam. 25.14; 2 Sam. 8.10 // 1 Chron. 18.10; 2 Kgs. 4.29; 10.15; Prov. 27.14.

⁶⁸⁸ Carlson 1964 interprets the figure of David according to the rubrics 'David under the blessing' (2 Samuel 2–7) and 'David under the curse' (2 Samuel 9–24), and irrespective of one's take on his thesis, he does acceptably highlight the significance of בִּרְךְ and בִּרְכָה in the book of Samuel.

⁶⁸⁹ בִּרְךְ יְהוָה in 1 Chron. 16.36 is not discussed here.

⁶⁹⁰ Murray 1998: 139 n. 88; 146 n. 103 discusses the motif of dismissal/dispersal homeward as an episode or narrative close-out in the Bible. Dillard 1987: 58 calls attention to the parallel between David and Solomon (1 Kgs. 8.66 // 2 Chron. 7.10), each of whom dismisses a 'national' assembly.

(2 Sam. 6.20 // 1 Chron. 16.43).⁶⁹¹ David's blessing of 'the people' in 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2 upon the second mission's success complements the participation of 'the people' in 2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6 in the aborted first mission. Similarly, David's departure to bless his own household in 2 Sam. 6.20 // 1 Chron. 16.43 continues (but does not yet conclude) the string of references to בית in 2 Sam. 6.3-5, 10-12, 15, 19 // 1 Chron. 13.7, [8], 13-14; 15.25, [28], 43.⁶⁹²

The theme of 'blessing' is closely related to the Michal material in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29; 2 Sam. 6.20b-23; and to the covenant between Yahweh and David in 2 Samuel 7 // 1 Chronicles 17. Some suggest that David's (attempted) blessing on his house is 'undone' by Michal's reproach.⁶⁹³ Rather, the blessing on David to the exclusion of Saul is realised precisely through Michal's childlessness (2 Sam. 6.23) and Yahweh's promise to David in the following chapter.⁶⁹⁴ In 2 Samuel 6–7 בֵּית and בָּרַךְ occur 6 and 27 times, respectively, and in 1 Chronicles 13, 15–17 they occur 7 and 23 times, respectively. David's success culminates in blessing for each Israelite home—except for Saul's—and this end has an important anticipatory role in both narratives, paving the way for 2 Samuel 7 // 1 Chronicles 17.

5.2 Summary of Chapter Five

Scholars assign cultic relevance to many facets of the ark story: the ark and its epithet; the status of Abinadab, his sons Uzzah and Ahio, and Obed-edom, and the nature of their בָּתִּים; the status of the nameless transporters in the second attempt; the mood

⁶⁹¹ Selman 1994: 166 discerns a chiasmic arrangement in the structure of 1 Chronicles 16: a = 16.1-3 (God's blessing for every Israelite); b = 16.4-7 (Levites appointed for worship at Jerusalem); c = 16.8-36 (psalm of praise); b₁ = 16.37-42 (Levites and priests appointed for worship at Gibeon); a₁ = 16.43 (blessing for David's household). Also see Japhet 1993: 312-313.

⁶⁹² See 3.1.3.4 and Gelandner 1991: 47; cf. 47-50.

⁶⁹³ Murray 1998: 140-142, 156; Youngblood 1992: 876; cf. Rosenberg 1986: 118.

⁶⁹⁴ See 5.1.1.2 and the comments on the ark's home in 5.1.2.3.

(rejoicing), sounds (voices, instruments) and movements (dance) in each attempt; the threshing floor; Michal at the window; the sacrifices; the tent; David's 'self-revelation', clothing (ephod), blessing and distribution of foodstuff; and the significance of the new cart pulled by oxen and Uzzah's extending his hand to the ark, each of which has been interpreted as an instance of cultic error.

A significant challenge in reading this material is keeping in mind well-known features of biblical and ancient near eastern religion without *forcing* them into the stories of David's transfer of the ark in Samuel and Chronicles. Scholars use 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles, 13, 15–16 as both a source and illustration of the theme 'royal priesthood' or 'sacral kingship'. The story in Samuel *and* Chronicles certainly depicts David as a king-priest. However, scholars disagree appreciably in their explanation of this image as one which is either 'completely holy' or 'wholly scandalous'. These divergent interpretations are a result of the degree to which scholars interpret particular features in the story in view of descriptions and prescriptions in 'P'. Nonetheless, beyond the fact that canonically earlier legal material may not precede chronologically the stories of David's transfer of the ark in their original or partially revised forms, is the fact that many features of David's story stand at a distance from the 'Priestly' material. This is especially true for the book of Samuel.⁶⁹⁵ Consequently, one must resist the uncritical acceptance of two common reading strategies for 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16: (1) reading the differences in 2 Sam. 6.11–20 versus 2 Sam. 6.1–10 in light of 'P' and (2) reading the differences in 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 vis-à-vis 2 Samuel 6 in light of 'P'.

⁶⁹⁵ The origin and development of the Israelite priesthood, as well as the relationship between priests and Levites, constitute one of the major problems of biblical scholarship. Samuel in particular is quite anomalous within the continuum of biblical 'historical' literature. The book stands at a considerable distance from 'P'. In addition to the obscure identification and function of 'ephod' in Samuel, one can also mention as examples the presence of Levites in 1 Sam. 6.15 and 2 Sam. 15.24 only; the depiction of Aaron more as a deliverer than a priest in 1 Sam. 12.6, 8; and the assertions that David's sons (MT 2 Sam. 8.18) and Ira the Jairite (2 Sam. 20.26) are priests.

The balance of this chapter deals with the attendant circumstances of the ark's transfer (5.1.3). This focus is not surprising since textual and interpretative difficulties abound in 2 Sam. 6.12-20a // 1 Chron. 15.25-16.3, 43. The focus on David as king-priest in this story influenced the transmitters such that their changing religious sensibilities led to developments in the transmission of the textual traditions. The following points summarise the significant textual and literary issues discussed in this chapter. First, the only lengthy plus or minus in this material is the נגד clause in 2 Sam. 6.12. It is equally if not more likely that Samuel encourages (by supplementation) a cautious or fearful David than that Chronicles eliminates (by deletion) an opportunistic one. See 5.1.1.3. Second, it is suggested that בביתו in 1 Chron. 13.14 (// 2 Sam. 6.11) and ועל-דוד אפוד בד in 1 Chron. 15.27 (// 2 Sam. 6.14) are interpolations in Chronicles from Samuel. See 5.1.1.1, 5.1.3.7. In addition, an original עלות in 2 Sam. 6.18 may have been altered to עלה, followed by the updating from plural to singular in 1 Chron. 16.2 as well. See 3.1.3.5. Third, the following connections in terminology are additional to the links between the David and Saul stories which are mentioned in the following point. 1 Sam. 4.5 and 2 Sam. 6.15 share תרועה at the point of entrance of the ark into Israel's camp and capital, respectively. See 5.1.3.2. 1 Sam. 5.2, 3, 11 and 2 Sam. 6.17 share the verb יצג and the noun מקום. See 5.1.2.3. Yahweh's פרץ against the Philistines and his subsequent צעד in 2 Sam. 5.20, 24 are analogous to Yahweh's פרץ against Uzzah and David's responsive צעד in 2 Sam. 6.8, 13. See 5.1.3.3. 1 Chron. 15.26 and Num. 23.1, 29 share the sevenfold sacrifice of פרים and אילים. See 5.1.3.4. 1 Chron. 15.28; 16.1 and Num 10.10 share חצצרה, עלה, and שלם, and לפני (ה)אלהים. See 5.1.3.2, 5.1.3.5. Fourth, the theme apology of Davidic kingship. The following terminology in 2 Sam. 6.11-20a relates to David's pre-eminence as king: ברך and בית in 6.11, 12, 20 (5.1.1.2, 5.1.1.3, 5.1.3.10); המלך דוד in 6.12 (5.1.1.3); אפוד בד in 6.14 (5.1.37); עלה and שלם in 6.17, 18 (5.1.3.5); המון in 2 Sam. 6.19 (5.1.3.8); and perhaps

חלק in 6.19 (5.1.3.8). Fifth, the theme apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character. David's kingly ability and religious sensibility are implicit throughout the story. He successfully returned the ark with celebration and reverence. David was not an opportunist. Rather, he responded to Yahweh's favourable blessing, guiding the removal of the ark as king-priest and bringing blessing to his people. Sixth, the theme influence of cultic practice. It is shown at many points in 5.1.3 that Samuel rather than Chronicles probably contains the revised form of the story and that in some instances both may have undergone revision from a 'more neutral' original. Scholars tend to assume that editors updated Chronicles according to a corporate-levitical thrust, but this chapter has shown that they may equally or more probably have revised Samuel with an interest in David's royal-sacral status.

CHAPTER SIX

Analysis of 2 Samuel 6.16, 20b-23 and 1 Chronicles 15.29

6.0 Introduction

Previous chapters analyse textual and literary details in 2 Sam. 6.1-15, 17a-20a //

1 Chron. 13.5-14; 15.25-28; 16.1-3, 43 which relate:

the <u>exposition</u> of the main plot	2 Sam. 6.1-5 // 1 Chron. 13.5-8 (+ 13.1-4)
the <u>inciting incident</u> , initiating the conflict or complication	2 Sam. 6.6-7 // 1 Chron. 13.9-10
the <u>rising action</u>	2 Sam. 6.8-15 // 1 Chron. 13.11-14; 15.25-28
the <u>climax</u> or turning point	2 Sam. 6.17a // 1 Chron. 16.1a
the <u>resolution</u> or denouement or falling action	2 Sam. 6.17b-20a // 1 Chron. 16.1b-3, 43 (+ 16.4-42)

The successful transfer of the ark to David's city is narrated in 2 Sam. 6.12-17 // 1 Chron. 15.25-16.1, first by a proleptic portrayal of the event (6.12 // 15.25; לַהֲעֹלֹתָ/וַיַּעַל), followed by a vivid depiction of the ascent up the south-eastern hill of Jerusalem toward the city (6.15 // 15.28; מַעְלִים), and finally by the arrival of the ark into the city and its deposit '(in its place) inside the tent' (6.17 // 16.1; וַיִּבְנוּ וַיַּיָּצֵג וַיִּבְנוּ וַיַּיָּצֵג). Immediately prior to this climax, the narrator unexpectedly introduces 'Michal, the daughter of Saul', who observes from 'the window' David's celebratory behaviour 'before Yahweh', and she loathes him extremely (6.16 // 15.29). The storyteller situates the Michal incident at its chronological point in the narrative, in the interval between the ark's ascent (עֹלָה) and its explicit introduction (הִבִּיאַ) and placement (הִצִּיג) in its abode, and for this reason MT has the *qotel* form of בּוֹא in 6.16 // 15.29. In contrast, the storyteller's brief comment relates neither Michal's affiliation to *David*, nor the location of 'the window', nor the reason for her disdain. Does silence in these matters presuppose earlier canonical accounts regarding

Michal⁶⁹⁶ or did it suggest their addition? Does previous information concerning Saul⁶⁹⁷ sufficiently prepare for *his daughter's* reaction to King David? If so, are the depiction of Saul's death in 1 Samuel 31 // 1 Chronicles 10 and the brief statement in 2 Sam. 5.2 // 1 Chron. 11.2 adequate for making sense of Michal's disgust?

The unexpected introduction of an additional character in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 launches a secondary or subsidiary or sub-plot in the story of David's transfer of the ark insofar as the brief exposition and inciting incident in 2 Sam. 6.16 is developed, consummated and resolved in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23. In and of itself, 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 is a terse and tantalising remark which neither hinders nor subverts the main plot of the story. Furthermore, the 'conflict' in 2 Sam. 6.16 between King David and Michal, the daughter of Saul the former king, is carefully integrated into 2 Sam. 6.1-5, 11-15, 17-20a, and more so in 20b-23, by means of linkages with material in 1 Samuel which function as an apology for Davidic rather than Saulide kingship.

Following 2 Sam. 6.16 most pay limited attention to vv. 17-20a in their haste to get on with Michal's story in vv. 20b-23. Alter remarks that we might expect the story to precede directly from v. 16 to v. 20b:

Instead of preceding directly to the confrontation between Michal and David, as we might expect, the narrative lingers for a long moment over David's cultic ministrations and royal benefactions to the people. One can imagine that Michal continues to watch from the window at David, performing his role as the people's darling, and that she continues to simmer.⁶⁹⁸

⁶⁹⁶ 1 Sam. 14.49; 18.20-28; 19.11-17; 25.44; 2 Sam. 3.13-14.

⁶⁹⁷ 1 Samuel 9-31; 2 Samuel 1-4 and 5.2; 1 Chronicles 10 and 5.10; 8.33; 9.39; 11.2; 12.1-2, 19, 23, 29; 13.3.

⁶⁹⁸ Alter 1999: 228.

On the other hand, following the entrance of the ark, the return of the people to their homes, and David's return to his residence, why was not v. 16 introduced at this point as an antecedent circumstance?⁶⁹⁹

17	They brought (ויבאו) in the ark.
19b	All the people went (וילך) to their houses.
20a	David returned (וישב) to bless his house.
16	Now Saul's daughter Michal was looking through the window when Yahweh's ark entered (cf. ויבאו in 6.17) David's city and she saw King David ... ומיכל בת-שאול נשקפה בעד חהלון כבוא ארון יהוה עיר דוד ותרא את-המלך דוד ...
20b	So David came (ויבוא) to his house and Michal Saul's daughter exited (והצא) to meet David and said (והאמר) ...

Is the distribution of the Michal material related to logical progression, narrative strategy or literary history? The arrangement of the material raises the possibility that subsequent editors *affixed* the 'outcome' in vv. 20b-23 to 2 Sam. 6.1-20a since v. 16 was already securely *fixed* within the literary tradition.

6.1 Analysis

6.1.1 Textual Analysis

6.1.1.1 The Narrator's Report of Michal's Response to David

6.1.1.1.1 2 Sam. 6.16 וְהָיָה אֲרוֹן יְהוָה בָּא עִיר דָּוִד
1 Chron. 15.29 וַיְהִי אֲרוֹן בְּרִית יְהוָה בָּא עַד-עִיר דָּוִד

Samuel and Chronicles share 'the city of David' and the following 'Michal the daughter of Saul'. These phrases set apart (literarily) the two dynasties. Chronicles has two pluses vis-à-vis (MT) Samuel: בְּרִית and עַד. Regarding the first plus, an original 'the ark' (LXX^{BMN} Samuel) is expanded to 'the ark of Yahweh' (MT and LXX^{AL} Samuel) and to 'the ark of the covenant of Yahweh' (MT and LXX^{ABL} Chronicles, 4QSam^a?⁷⁰⁰).⁷⁰¹

⁶⁹⁹ See Niccacci 1990: §39-40, pp. 62-63. For example, in the earlier ark story, the ark is captured in 1 Sam. 4.11, and after the messenger's report, the deaths of Eli and his daughter-in-law, and the birth of Ichabod, 1 Sam. 5.1 says: 'Now when the Philistines had captured (וּפְלִשְׁתִּים לָקְחוּ) the ark of God, they brought it from Ebenezer to Ashdod'.

⁷⁰⁰ Herbert 1997b: 127 has בְּרִית in one suggested reconstruction of 4QSam^a.

Regarding the second plus, Chronicles' preposition עַד or a variant (e.g., ל) is reflected in all witnesses to Chronicles⁷⁰² and Samuel *except for MT Samuel*.⁷⁰³ Commentators offer contradictory appraisals of the discrepancy, but Jackson and Stoebe are certainly wrong to consider the 'addition' of the preposition in Chronicles a feature of 'later' or 'younger' speech.⁷⁰⁴ Nysse believes the agreement between Chronicles and non-MT Samuel points to a period of common history.⁷⁰⁵

Samuel and Chronicles disagree on the introductory verb. Most think וַיְהִי was originally in Samuel, and Chronicles either (1) adopted this reading from its yet uncorrupted Samuel *Vorlage* having וַיְהִי or (2) corrected its already corrupt Samuel *Vorlage* having וַהֲיָה.⁷⁰⁶ Some think וַהֲיָה was the original reading in Samuel, and Chronicles altered the form to וַיְהִי, either to (1) 'correct' the grammar or (2) minimise the rhetoric of the passage (see below). On one hand, וַיְהִי in 4QSam^a and MT 1 Chron. 15.29, and καὶ ἐγένετο in the Greek versions of both books, suggest that וַהֲיָה is unoriginal in Samuel. Nevertheless, scholars holding this view attribute to the Chronicler either a keen sense of 'classical' Hebrew or interpretative insight (!). On the other hand, the same evidence suggests that וַיְהִי once stood in MT 2 Sam. 6.16. Indeed, this is more probable than positing sweeping adjustments in all versions except MT Samuel. The form וַהֲיָה is unoriginal to this passage and at the same time it is not the product of historical developments in Hebrew grammar.⁷⁰⁷ However, the form is *pragmatically effective* in MT

⁷⁰¹ McCarter 1984: 167; cf. Jackson 1962: 105; Nysse 1984: 367, 403, 475. Also see appendix 2.

⁷⁰² BHS observes, however, that many (more than twenty) medieval Hebrew manuscripts lack the preposition עַד. See De Rossi 1784: IV, 180.

⁷⁰³ Fincke 2001: 156, and Herbert 1997b: 127 in one reconstruction, read עַד in 4QSam^a.

⁷⁰⁴ Jackson 1962: 186; Stoebe 1994: 196. See appendix 3.

⁷⁰⁵ Nysse 1984: 437, 440.

⁷⁰⁶ Some suggest emending וַהֲיָה to a word other than וַהֲיָה: וַהֲוָה, וַהֲנָה, וַהֲאָרֶן, וַהֲיָה (infinitive absolute of וַהֲיָה).

⁷⁰⁷ See appendix 3. Furthermore, וַהֲיָה does not support the view that the whole of 2 Sam. 6.16 is a secondary insertion into the story of the ark. This is suggested in Rost 1982: 13 and by others who believe the verse begins the so-called 'Succession Narrative' or 'Court History'.

2 Sam. 6.16 because it rhetorically introduces a parenthetical scene (in the midst of vv. 11-15, 17-20a) which *stresses* the antipathy of Saul's daughter Michal toward David and *foreshadows* the development of this theme in Samuel's supplement in vv. 20b-23.⁷⁰⁸ Finally, it is unnecessary in this context to comment further on the form בָּא or its use following וַיְהִי/וְהָיָה, except to remark that the construction could represent (1) an introductory or preparatory formula ('and it happened') followed by an independent *qatal* or *qotel* form of בָּא or (2) a copulative or predicative verb which in combination with a subsequent *qotel* form constitutes a periphrastic construction. MT's הָיָה followed by the *qotel* of בָּא favours the first option.

6.1.1.1.2 2 Sam. 6.16

ומִיכָל בַּת־שָׁאֹל נִשְׁקָפָה בְּעֵד הַחֲלוֹן

1 Chron. 15.29

The Hebrew, Aramaic and Latin versions have 'Michal' or 'Michol' whereas the Greek and Syriac versions have 'Melchol'.⁷⁰⁹ Did the form without the first 'L' arise accidentally or is 'Michal' an intentional adjustment?⁷¹⁰ 'Michal' (מִיכָל) is the abbreviated form of 'Michael' (מִיכָאֵל), 'Who is like El?', yet Yahweh appears 21 times in 2 Samuel 6 and 41 times in 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. The (repetitious) identification of Michal as בַּת־שָׁאֹל ('Saul's daughter')⁷¹¹ rather than just 'Michal' or 'David's wife' or even 'Palti's wife', is significant because the patronymic strategically identifies her as a Saulide

⁷⁰⁸ Most commentators considering וַיְהִי the original reading in Samuel seek to determine the narrative function of the verb form. Conversely, de Boer 1974 thinks the verse is secondary and unnecessary to vv. 20b-23 but he also thinks the form וַיְהִי was deliberately chosen by the reviser in accordance with a particular discourse function. Practitioners of text- or discourse linguistics have elucidated the function of many past-*w^eqatal* forms in the Bible, e.g., Fokkelman 1991; Isaksson 1998; Longacre 1994; throughout Eskhult 1990; also Kim 1998.

⁷⁰⁹ Allen 1974: I, 136, 192 and Englert 1949: 58 discuss Greek Chronicles and Syriac Samuel, respectively. The Greek manuscripts have many variant spellings.

⁷¹⁰ Does the revision of the original μερόβ to μιχόλ rather than to the conventional μελχόλ in LXX^B 2 Sam. 21.8 indicate a *Vorlage* other than the form מִיכָל where μελχόλ appears in Greek Samuel?

⁷¹¹ Fincke 2001: 156 does not include בַּת־שָׁאֹל in his reconstruction of 4QSam^a but this is highly improbable (Herbert 1997b: 127).

representative, and she thinks and acts like one too ('like father, like daughter'). Michal is just 'Michal' in 1 Sam. 19.12-17, after being introduced as David's wife, and in 2 Sam. 6.21 (see 6.1.1.3.1), but elsewhere in Samuel she is:

- 1 Sam. 14.49: one of Saul's two daughters; Saul's younger daughter
- 1 Sam. 18.20, 27-28: Saul's daughter (three times); David's wife
- 1 Sam. 19.11: David's wife
- 1 Sam. 25.44: Saul's daughter; David's and Palti's wife
- 2 Sam. 3.13-14: Saul's daughter; David's wife
- 2 Sam. 6.16 (// 1 Chron. 15.29), 20, 23: Saul's daughter
- 2 Sam. 21.8: Saul's daughter

Many remark on the abusive use made of Michal in Samuel and some correctly emphasise the polemic of Michal's epithet.⁷¹² As the ark and David arrive, Michal is portrayed as peering through 'the window' (of the royal residence?⁷¹³; cf. 2 Sam. 5.11; 7.1-2) at the arriving procession. Several strands of evidence are brought to bear on the interpretation of Michal's position in the window, including archaeological evidence for windows, and window scenes in iconography and non-biblical literature in which a woman in a window may be a *cultic* motif.⁷¹⁴ Turning to biblical literature: (1) In the immediate context this scene is an interruption in the flow of the narrative, which depicts Michal as a distant non-participant in the events. Why isn't Michal present when many other men *and women* are? (2) In the book of Samuel a window scene occurs elsewhere only in 1 Sam. 19.12, where (ironically) Michal lets David down through a window so that he can escape from her father Saul. (3) Moving beyond the book of Samuel, the noun חלון is relatively uncommon (31 times, including twelve in Ezekiel), and rarely is a person portrayed as peering or acting through a window (בעד חלון): Gen. 26.8; Josh. 2.15 (cf. 18, 21); Judg. 5.28; 1 Sam. 19.12; 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29; 2 Kgs. 9.30 (cf. 32). In all these passages, except for Gen. 26.8, the person at the window is a woman, and sexual

⁷¹² Clines 1991a (= Clines 1972: 266, 269-272); de Regt 1999: 69; cf. 59-72.

⁷¹³ In contrast to most private houses ancient palaces had windows (Aharoni 1982: 216-217; Fritz 1995: 134).

⁷¹⁴ See the commentaries and Bietenhard 1999: 3-7 who cites the most recent literature.

potential and menacing circumstances are present (as also in Prov. 7.6 and Cant. 2.9).⁷¹⁵ However, it is unclear how Michal should be related to one or more of Rahab, Sisera's mother and Jezebel.

6.1.1.1.3	2 Sam. 6.16 1 Chron. 15.29	וַתֵּרָא אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה וַתֵּרָא אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד מִרְקַד וּמִשְׁחָק
-----------	-------------------------------	---

All witnesses have 'King David' except Targum Chronicles which has מלכא alone. The distribution (here and in 2 Sam. 6.12, 20) and usage of this phrase are discussed in 5.1.1.3. Michal sees 'King David' dancing and soon she will address him directly as 'the King of Israel'. Commentators correctly assert that the words highlight David's kingly status, not to emphasise his non-kingly behaviour, but to underline Michal's (and her father Saul's) distance from the king, with respect both to personal disposition and to monarchical rank. The significance of the addition of לפני יהוה in Samuel is discussed above in 3.1.4.1 and 5.1.3.5 and 5.1.3.6, below in 6.1.1.3.2 and 6.1.1.3.4, and also in appendix 2. Michal *sees* King David dancing *before Yahweh* thus suggesting that the theological adverbial here is synonymous with 'before the ark'.⁷¹⁶

The use of מִשְׁחָקִים/παίζοντες in all witnesses to 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 where the nature of David's activity is apparently not an issue stands out against the difficulty one encounters in trying to determine the character of David's activity and enlighten the diverse terminology used for it in 2 Sam. 6.13-14, 16 // 1 Chron. 15.26-27, 29 and in 2 Sam. 6.20b-21. The textual evidence for the verb lexemes in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 is:

⁷¹⁵ O'Connell 1991: 235-237.

⁷¹⁶ Carlson 1964: 73; Iglesias González, Alonso Schökel and Valverde 1973: 181.

Samuel		
MT, 4QSam ^{a?}	מפוז ומכרכר	'leaping and whirling' (see 5.1.3.6)
Targum	מרקיד ומשבח	'dancing and praising'
Peshitta	דעא המחלל	'rejoicing and making merry'
Jacob	דעא המחלל המחלל המחלל	'rejoicing and dancing and playing music and making merry'
LXX ^A	ἀνακρουόμενον καὶ ὀρχούμενον	'playing music and dancing'
LXX ^B	ὀρχούμενον καὶ ἀνακρουόμενον	'dancing and playing music'
LXX ^L	παίζοντα καὶ ὀρχούμενον καὶ ἀνακρουόμενον	'dancing and dancing and playing music'
Aquila	διατινασσόμενον καὶ καρχαρούμενον	'shaking and whirling'
Symmachus	σκιρτῶντα καὶ καγχάζοντα	'skipping and laughing'
OL, Vulgate	<i>subsilientem atque saltantem</i>	'jumping and dancing'

Chronicles		
MT	מרקד ומשבח	'skipping and making merry'
Targum	מפוז ומשבח	'leaping and praising'
Peshitta	דעא המחלל	'rejoicing and making merry'
LXX ^{ABL}	ὀρχούμενον καὶ παίζοντα	'dancing and dancing'
OL, Vulgate	<i>saltantem atque ludentem</i>	'dancing and making merry'

This material is difficult. (1) The versions disagree on the precise nature of David's activity, which is described by verbs ranging in meaning from generic dance ('dancing') to aggressive dance ('jumping, leaping, shaking, skipping, whirling') to music ('playing music') to celebration ('making merry, laughing, playing, praising, rejoicing'). (2) The meanings of some verbs in this material are unclear. It is uncertain which verbs should be aligned with each other in a diagrammatic presentation. It is difficult to determine to what

extent a particular verb represents either a legitimate attempt on the part of the editor or translator to represent the meaning of the word in his *Vorlage*, or alternatively, a change related to (a) an interpretation due to unawareness of the meaning, or (b) an assimilation to a verb form in another verse of the passage, or (c) a desire to polemicise (i.e., safeguard David's character). (3) 4QSam^a is partly intact for 2 Sam. 6.16 and must differ from MT Samuel based on space considerations.⁷¹⁷ (4) The witnesses to Greek Samuel diverge regarding the quantity and order of verbs, and the affiliation of the Greek lexemes to the lexemes in MT Samuel is uncertain.⁷¹⁸ Scholars give different interpretations to Samuel's מפון ומכרכר, but mostly concur that the Chronicler altered his *Vorlage* (a) to more ordinary terms to ease readability or (b) to more subdued terms to tone down David's unseemly behaviour. MT Chronicles' vocabulary is more common than MT Samuel's, but see 6.1.1.3.4 on רקד.⁷¹⁹ This fact together with the earlier appearance of שחק in 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8 may account for the appearance of שחק in Chronicles instead of Samuel's כרר (cf. מכרכר in 2 Sam. 6.14 but מכרבל in 1 Chron. 15.27). However, the occurrence of παύω prior to the other two verbs in LXX^L Samuel raises suspicion regarding this seemingly straight-forward explanation. The textual evidence raises even greater doubt regarding the originality of Samuel's פון which stands parallel to Chronicles' רקד. The appearance of ὀρχέσμαι in LXX 2 Sam. 6.16 and the observation that outside 2 Samuel 6 the verb corresponds to רקד (1 Chron. 15.29; Qoh. 3.4; Isa. 13.21) suggest that MT Samuel has been revised.⁷²⁰ The absence of רקד in MT 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-21 may point to

⁷¹⁷ Fincke 2001: 156; Herbert 1997b: 127.

⁷¹⁸ See Jackson 1962: 105; McCarter 1984: 167, 171; Seow 1989: 111; especially Nysse 1984: 283-284.

⁷¹⁹ פון occurs twice (Gen. 49.24; 2 Sam. 6.16); כרר occurs twice (2 Sam. 6.14, 16); רקד occurs nine times in the Latter Prophets and Writings (including 1 Chron. 15.29); and the D forms of שחק/שחק occur twenty-four times (including 1 Sam. 18.7; 2 Sam. 2.14; 6.5, 21; 1 Chron. 13.8; 15.29).

⁷²⁰ Is this also suggested by מרקיד and מכרמ in Targum and Jacob Samuel, respectively? Aramaic פווא and Syriac ܦܐ are cognate to Hebrew פון.

a systematic suppression of the term in the received version of David's transfer of the ark.
See 6.1.1.2.3 and 6.1.1.3.4.

6.1.1.1.4 2 Sam. 6.16

וַתָּבוּ לוֹ בִּלְבָבָהּ

1 Chron. 15.29

The reason for the variation in the genitive pronoun in Greek Samuel (αὐτοῦ, ἐαυτῆς, αὐτῆς) is unclear. Greek Chronicles has ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῆς rather than the expected ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς (cf. LXX^L Samuel). Most consider 'in her soul' a secondary reading whereas Fincke thinks the translator of Greek Chronicles had בנפשה in his *Vorlage*.⁷²¹ Unfortunately, a comprehensive analysis of translation technique for לב/לבב and נפש in Greek Chronicles gives mixed results, thus making it impossible to discern the origin of ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῆς.⁷²² Fokkelman suggests that the complement denotes intensity, thus meaning 'Michal despised him *deeply*'.⁷²³

The verb וַתָּבוּ is pointed as a G 3fs *wayyiqtol* of בזה. On one hand, Ehrlich indicates that the synonym בו regularly takes a direct object introduced by ל but that בזה does not, and consequently he suggests that וַתָּבוּ in Samuel and Chronicles should be emended to וַתָּבוּ.⁷²⁴ This suggestion is accepted in *BH^{III}* and *BHS*, and by Rudolph⁷²⁵, but it is rejected by *BDB*, Görg and Stoebe.⁷²⁶ On the other hand, the received versions of Samuel and Chronicles do not make use of בו, which occurs in 2 Kgs. 19.21 and elsewhere thirteen times in the Latter Prophets and Writings, but בזה does appear in 1

⁷²¹ Fincke 2001: 156.

⁷²² The Greek version, including LXX Chronicles, normally uses καρδία for לב/לבב and ψυχή for נפש, but ψυχή is parallel to לב a number of times in some manuscripts of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms and Proverbs, as well as in 2 Kgs. 6.11 (LXX^L has καρδία) and on nine occasions in Chronicles for which textual variation is absent: 1 Chron. 12.39 (twice); 15.29; 17.2; 22.7; 2 Chron. 7.11; 9.1; 15.15; 31.21. Additional discussion is unrequired.

⁷²³ Fokkelman 1990: 196 n. 97.

⁷²⁴ Ehrlich 1910: 287; 1914: 341.

⁷²⁵ Rudolph 1955: 119.

⁷²⁶ *BDB* 512; Görg 1975: 61; Stoebe 1994: 196.

Sam. 2.30; 10.27; 17.42; 2 Sam. 12.9, 10 and 2 Chron. 36.16, and elsewhere twice in the Pentateuch and thirty-two times in the Latter Prophets and Writings. The verbs בזה and בן are synonymous in meaning⁷²⁷, the Greek translators render both with ἐξουδ/θενέ/όω (among other verbs), and neither Hebrew verb is 'earlier' or 'later'⁷²⁸, so that neither usage nor translation technique nor the chronology of biblical Hebrew enlightens the textual history.

In biblical Hebrew the prepositions א, ב and ל mark the direct object, the so-called 'prepositional object'. In this passage, the direct object is introduced with ל in MT Samuel and Chronicles, and perhaps in 4QSam^a, with על in the Aramaic and Syriac versions⁷²⁹, and as a pronominal object alone in the Greek and Latin versions. An examination of Greek translation technique shows that the absence of a preposition does not suggest a *Vorlage* without ל. The verb בן introduces its direct object with ל except in Prov. 1.7; 23.22, and בזה takes an accusative direct object. The introduction of the direct object by ל in both 2 Sam. 6.16 and 1 Chron. 15.29 is remarkable since many believe this construction is 'late' and due to Aramaic influence.⁷³⁰ Williams thinks the usage here is a stylistic variant which he calls the '*lamed* of specification'.⁷³¹ Ewald comments that the construction may be due to 'an object of some importance'.⁷³² Indeed, ל + בזה (and the following בלבה too—see above) function to accentuate the intensity of Michal's feelings for David.

⁷²⁷ Both mean 'belittle, contemn, deride, despise, disdain, dishonour, loathe, repudiate, scorn, spurn, think lightly of, hold as insignificant, look down on, show despite toward, be contemptible toward, show/hold in/regard with contempt'.

⁷²⁸ See appendix 3.

⁷²⁹ The Aramaic verb בסר when it means 'contemn' is regularly construed with the preposition על, rather than the usual י or ל.

⁷³⁰ See appendix 3.

⁷³¹ Williams 1976: §273, p. 49.

⁷³² Ewald 1881: 61.

The verb בזה is one of several in this passage and of many in the Bible which are related to the semantic fields of 'respect, honour, acceptance' (e.g., כבד in 2 Sam. 6.20, 22) and 'contempt, shame, rejection' (e.g., קלל in 2 Sam. 6.22). The subject of בזה/בוז may be divine or human, and the object may be divine, human or inanimate (e.g., birthright, oath, wisdom, word). The only other instance of בזה in Chronicles is in 2 Chron. 36.16 where the leading priests and the people mock the messengers of God, despising his words, and scoffing at his prophets. Similarly, David despises Yahweh's word and Yahweh too in 2 Sam. 12.9, 10.⁷³³ Elsewhere in Samuel, Eli and his sons despise Yahweh (1 Sam. 2.30), some worthless fellows despise Saul (1 Sam. 10.27), and Goliath despises David (1 Sam. 17.42). Yahweh condemns to insignificance those who despise what he chooses.⁷³⁴ Finally, Murray emphasises the rhetoric in וחתבו לו בלבה:

The rhythmic shortness of the phrase, in marked contrast to the longer clauses preceding it, and its intense assonance give it the pointedness of a dagger, a rhetorical thrust enhanced by its being kept to the end of this long sentence.⁷³⁵

6.1.1.2 Michal's Words to David

6.1.1.2.1 2 Sam. 6.20b

והצא מיכל בת-שאול לקראת דוד

As David approaches his house to bless it (2 Sam. 6.20a // 1 Chron. 16.43b) Michal (again 'the daughter of Saul') exits (the royal residence?; cf. 2 Sam. 5.11; 7.1-2) to confront him. The textual evidence is unremarkable. The verbs קרא II and קרה I occur most often in Samuel (23% of all occurrences) and usually as לקראת. Gordon and Murray relate the present instance of קרא to the stock scene of welcoming the returning hero or warrior.⁷³⁶ The verb is used this way in Samuel but this usage does not predominate.⁷³⁷

⁷³³ The deity's word is 'despised' elsewhere only in Num. 15.31; Prov. 13.13.

⁷³⁴ Waltke 1980: 99.

⁷³⁵ Murray 1998: 136.

⁷³⁶ Gordon 1986: 235; Murray 1998: 140.

Other meetings are more frequent, and more pronounced in Samuel, including some in which descendants of Saul or other Benjaminites meet David. These (non-synoptic) passages in 2 Samuel are 6.20 (Michal); 16.1 (Ziba); 19.17, 21 (Shimei); 19.25, 26 (Mephibosheth); and 20.1 (Sheba). Fokkelman remarks on the public location of Michal's defiance saying 'The lines 20a and b have the man and his wife as subject and show how their movements cut across each other, which is not a good sign. David returns "to bless his house" ... But Michal goes outside'.⁷³⁸ Michal is not a true member of David's house.

6.1.1.2.2 2 Sam. 6.20b

וְהָאָמַר מִדֶּנֶכְבֵּד הַיּוֹם מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל

Prior to וְהָאָמַר some versions have a plus, namely LXX^{ABL} (but not LXX^N) with καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτόν, Josephus with αὐτῷ κατηύχετο ('she invoked blessing upon him'), and Jacob with וּבִרְכָהּ ('and she blessed him'). The presumed *Vorlage* of the Greek and Syriac witnesses would be וְהִבְרַכְהוּ although Caspari thinks it may be מְבַרְכּוּ.⁷³⁹ The verb בָּרַךְ ('bless'—not 'greet'; cf. 5.1.3.10) is significant in this chapter, appearing earlier in vv. 11, 12, 18. Some scholars are indecisive or ambiguous about the originality of the verb phrase; others believe the phrase is secondary, perhaps to intensify the irony of Michal's response; and some think וְהִבְרַכְהוּ was either accidentally lost due to homoioarcton (on the basis of וְהִבְרַכְהוּ and וְהָאָמַר) or intentionally deleted as offensive from the lips of 'impious' or 'hypocritical' Michal. Scholars' discord underscores the absence of any firm basis for determining the status of the phrase.

⁷³⁷ 1 Sam. 4.1, 2; 17.2, 21, 48, 55; 18.6; 2 Sam. 1.6; 10.9, 10, 17; 18.6. It is interesting, however, that all five instances in synoptic texts in Samuel, Kings and Chronicles do entail the battle usage: 2 Sam. 10.5, 9, 10, 17 // 1 Chron. 19.5, 10, 11, 17, and 2 Kgs. 23.29 // 2 Chron. 35.20.

⁷³⁸ Fokkelman 1990: 198.

⁷³⁹ Caspari 1924: 474.

Michal's initial words to David in *the third person* using *his public title* are 'How Israel's king today got honour for himself!'⁷⁴⁰ Observe the contrast again between 'Michal the daughter of Saul' and 'David the king of Israel' and the repetition of 'today' twice in this verse. In view of the content of the following relative clause it is clear the queen is derogatorily mocking the king.⁷⁴¹ He has acted shamelessly, or so she believes. Alter says:

Until the final meeting between Michal and David, at no point is there any dialogue between them—an avoidance of verbal exchange particularly noticeable in the Bible, where such a large part of the burden of narration is taken up by dialogue. When that exchange finally comes, it is an explosion.⁷⁴²

6.1.1.2.3 2 Sam. 6.20b אשר נגלה היום לעיני אמהות עבדיו כהגלות נגלות אחד הרקים

This difficult relative clause is addressed in three stages: (1) אחד הרקים; (2) היום אשר נגלה ... כהגלות נגלות (3); לעיני אמהות עבדיו.

First, regarding the subject of the verb phrase in the subordinated comparative clause (אחד הרקים): That which David does he does like one of the ____? The ordinal number אחד/εἷς is unremarkable. The readings for the noun fall into five groups:

- 'Empty, idle, stupid, useless, vain, void, worthless': MT (הרקים), Targum (סריקיא), Peshitta (ܫܪܝܩܝܐ), Aquila (τῶν κενοῶν), Symmachus (τῶν εἰκαίων). Are the readings in Aquila and Symmachus assimilated or revised?
- 'Dancers': LXX^{ABL} (τῶν ὀρχουμένων), OL (*saltatoribus*).
- 'Worthless dancers': Jacob (ܫܪܝܩܝܐ ܕܠܐ ܕܢܚܝܡܝܐ). This is a conflation of the above variants.
- 'Buffoons': Vulgate (*scurris*). The affiliation of the Vulgate is unclear (cf. '?' in *BH*^{I-III}).

⁷⁴⁰ The particle מה (ironically here) expresses admiration or astonishment (*BDB* 553; *GKC* §148b, p. 471). The *qatal* verb form is reflexive (*GKC* §51e, pp. 137-138; Driver 1890: 271-272).

⁷⁴¹ C. L. Miller 1996: 274-275.

⁷⁴² Alter 1981: 123; cf. 1999: 228-229.

- 'Unseemly behaviour in dancing ... dance': Josephus (... ὡς ἀκοσμήσειεν ὀρχοῦμενος ... ὑπὸ τῆς ὀρχήσεως ...). Observe that Josephus refers to 'dance' here but that for v. 14 he speaks of David playing a musical instrument.

Most scholars retain MT as original, but Klostermann and Schlögl, followed by Orlinsky⁷⁴³, and several others⁷⁴⁴, believe MT's הרקים is a post-LXX *corruption* which should be emended to הרקדים following the LXX and OL. Orlinsky makes a case for the originality of הרקדים based on literary context, Greek translation technique, Hebrew style, Hebrew palaeography, and narrative criticism. Regarding the latter point, Polzin considers MT's הרקים 'opaque' and an 'obstacle to understanding'⁷⁴⁵ and Murray reinforces Orlinsky's view that הרקדים makes good sense⁷⁴⁶, thus countering statements such as הרקים is 'superior'⁷⁴⁷ or 'more forceful'⁷⁴⁸ or הרקדים 'destroys the real point of the comparison'⁷⁴⁹ or is 'ziemlich nichtssagend'.⁷⁵⁰ Orlinsky argues based on palaeography for the accidental loss of ד, causing הרקדים to become הרקים. However, was the received tradition deliberately altered? The root ריק is one of many dozens of biblical terms related to the notions of 'emptiness, idleness, stupidity, uselessness, vanity, worthlessness'. The adverb ריק occurs in 1 Sam. 6.3 and 2 Sam. 1.22 but other related terminology occurs infrequently in Samuel. MT's הרקים does not clearly link to any other biblical occurrence of the root ריק. However, Fokkelman points out the 'decrease in merit' with each term for people in Michal's list ('Israel ... slaves ... layabouts')⁷⁵¹, and Ackroyd says that by her use of הרקים ('empty-headed') Michal 'in fact reveals herself as the one who has no proper

⁷⁴³ Klostermann 1887: 154; Orlinsky 1946; Schlögl 1904: II, 37

⁷⁴⁴ Bressan 1960: 530; Jackson 1962: 107, 112, 189-190; McCarter 1984: 185; Murray 1998: 65.

⁷⁴⁵ Polzin 1993: 62, 66.

⁷⁴⁶ Murray 1998: 65.

⁷⁴⁷ Fokkelman 1990: 380; cf. 199.

⁷⁴⁸ A. A. Anderson 1989: 98.

⁷⁴⁹ Carlson 1964: 91.

⁷⁵⁰ Wellhausen 1871: 169.

⁷⁵¹ Fokkelman 1990: 199.

insight'.⁷⁵² Michal's choice of terminology in MT may say more about her than David. Finally, רַקִּד's absence in MT 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-21 may point to a systematic suppression of the term in the received version of David's transfer of the ark. See 6.1.1.3.4.

Second, regarding the adverbial and prepositional adjuncts to the principal verb in the relative clause (הַיּוֹם לְעֵינֵי אֲמָהוֹת עֲבָדָיו): That which David does he does in the eyes of society's lowest members. 'Eyes' and David's retort in v. 22 (also with 'eyes') are discussed below. The nouns אֲמָה (56 times) and שִׁפְחָה (63 times) refer to a female servant or slave⁷⁵³ and are the feminine counterparts to עֶבֶד. Michal's statement is clear: David's activity took place before or in the presence, or better, *precisely in the eyes*, of the slave girls of his servants.⁷⁵⁴ Why does it matter that these words are placed on the tongue of Michal? A look at the usage of אֲמָה and שִׁפְחָה in Samuel is enlightening:

אֲמָה	שִׁפְחָה	Referent
1S 1.11 (thrice), 16	1S 1.18	Hannah
	1S 8.16	שִׁפְחוֹת in general
1S 25.24 (twice), 25, 28, 31, 41	1S 25.27, 41	Abigail
	1S 28.21, 22	Medium of Endor
2S 6.20, 22		אֲמָהוֹת in general
2S 14.15-16	2S 14.6, 7, 12, 15, 17, 19	Wise woman of Tekoa
	2S 17.17	Girl reporting to Jonathan and Ahimaaz
2S 20.17		Wise woman of Abel Beth-maacah

2 Sam. 6.20 is the only instance where the female and male counterparts of servant/slave occur together in construct, but the wording of 1 Sam. 25.41 cannot be coincidental:

וַתֵּקֶם וַתִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה אִפְּיָם אֶרְצָה וַתֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה אֲמַתְךָ לְשִׁפְחָה לְרַחֵץ רַגְלֵי עֲבָדֶי אֲדָנִי

Polzin capitalises on the clear link between the two passages and the obvious contrast between the two wives. He observes that the noun 'only' appears in Samuel–Kings to designate a woman who by word or work furthers the cause of kingship in general and the

⁷⁵² Ackroyd 1977: 70.

⁷⁵³ These occur together in the same verse in 1 Sam. 25.41 and 2 Sam. 14.15 but they are not entirely synonymous.

⁷⁵⁴ Kleven 1991: 375 and McCarter 1984: 187 provide no evidence to support their view that אֲמָהוֹת is a synecdoche which applies to all the young women of Israel, whether slave or free.

glory of David's house in particular'.⁷⁵⁵ Abigail, David's wife, explicitly describes herself as an אִמָּה, and in so doing she advances David's kingship, but Michal, David's other wife and the daughter of Saul, would have nothing to do with an אִמָּה, and thereby she highlights her unworthiness as a member in the Davidic monarchy. Michal is *unlike* Hannah (1 Sam. 1.11, 16), Abigail (1 Sam. 25.24-25, 28, 31, 41) and the wise women of Tekoa (2 Sam. 14.15) and Abel Beth-maacah (2 Sam. 20.17).

Third, regarding the relative clause with its main verb and the synonymous verbs in the subordinated comparative clause (אֲשֶׁר נָגַלַּח ... כְּהַגְלֹחַ נָגַלַּח): What does David do? David's נָגַלַּח-ing is stated triply using the N perfect 3ms, the N infinitive construct⁷⁵⁶, and (perhaps) the N infinitive absolute.⁷⁵⁷ Both the form of the (supposed) infinitive absolute, as well as the occurrence of the same root in infinitive forms used side by side (in either order), are unique phenomena in the Bible. The text of 2 Sam. 6.20 is 'extraordinary'.⁷⁵⁸ Consequently many dispute the authenticity and meaning of the morphology and grammar of the statement, but to-date a consensus has not been reached. Some believe הַגְלֹחַ נָגַלַּח is erroneous (or at least suspicious), either a dittography which has undergone adjustment or a conflation of two alternative readings.⁷⁵⁹ Others believe הַגְלֹחַ נָגַלַּח is legitimate, and that the second infinitive emphasises ('rhetorically heightens') the first on the analogy of the construction with the finite verb.⁷⁶⁰ The form נָגַלַּח is explained either as written with ה for the sake of assonance⁷⁶¹ or as an attraction: the infinitive absolute

⁷⁵⁵ Polzin 1993: 67; cf. 67-68, 143-148.

⁷⁵⁶ Elsewhere only in Isa. 56.1 and Ezek. 21.29.

⁷⁵⁷ Elsewhere only in 1 Sam. 2.27, but as the expected form הַנְּגַלַּח.

⁷⁵⁸ GKC §75y, p. 213.

⁷⁵⁹ GKC §75y, p. 213; Bauer and Leander 1922: §57t, p. 422; Bergsträsser 1918: II, §30c, p. 161; cf. commentaries.

⁷⁶⁰ A. B. Davidson 1901: §86c, p. 118-119.

⁷⁶¹ Elsewhere in Isa. 22.13; 42.20; Hos. 10.4; Hab. 3.13. See GKC §75n, p. 210; König 1881: I, 536.

passed into the infinitive construct under the influence of the preceding כ.⁷⁶² Talmon gives this explanation for the morphology and grammar:

Here כהגלות – כגלות are variant forms of the Niph'al infinitive [construct] which have been conflated, as was observed by Kimchi: 'Both of them are infinitives [construct] of the Niph'al. One has the full form of strong verbs [= כגלות], as in דוד נשאל, while in the other there is the usual omission of the *nun* of the Niph'al (as in weak verbs) [כהגלות].'⁷⁶³

Talmon's solution has the advantages of explaining why the Hebrew text (1) fails to use the expected form of the infinitive absolute (cf. 1 Sam. 2.27) and (b) contains such exceptional grammar. כגלות is an alternative infinitive construct form of the infinitive construct כהגלות. He adds that the Greek version harmonised the double reading by turning one of the two infinitives into a finite verb, and that the Targum went still further and translated both of them as finite verbs derived from two different Aramaic roots. Otherwise, the Greek version is unremarkable. Adjustments similar to these are also evident in the Syriac and Latin versions. Finally, the Targum (דחליי) and Latin (*et nudatus est quasi si nudetur*) versions and Josephus (γυμνούμενος) explicitly characterise David's self-exposure as nudity.

The verb גלה means 'uncover, remove' in the G stem, but the N may be either reflexive ('expose, reveal, uncover oneself') or passive ('be exposed, revealed, uncovered'). By consensus the verbs in this verse are understood as reflexive, although the passive understanding may be workable. In either case, Michal's point is that David 'exposed himself' or 'was exposed' (by his own doing). What does this mean? The consensus is that David exposed his body either in partial or full nudity. Most think David was just scantily clad: he was not completely naked and he did not expose his genitalia. Some, however, think David inadvertently exposed his genitalia or completely disrobed himself. On the contrary, Polzin believes David's dress in an ephod is sufficient to

⁷⁶² Ewald 1855: §240c, p. 607.

⁷⁶³ Talmon 1960: 174.

disprove all these claims: he was not scantily clad, therefore he could not expose his genitalia, and he was definitely not naked.⁷⁶⁴ Baldwin and Gunn make the implausible suggestion that גלה here means 'to show off'.⁷⁶⁵

The verb גלה does not by itself designate stripping or (full) nudity, except perhaps in Gen. 9.21 where the HtD form is used, but observe ערוה in vv. 22-23. Similarly, ערוה occurs in other passages with גלה (mostly in the D stem) when reference is made to nudity⁷⁶⁶, and שול occurs with גלה in Jer. 13.22. In addition, neither David's use of an אפוד בך in 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27, which may be a belated feature in the story (see 5.1.3.7), nor Michal's intense reaction, necessarily support the view that David wore insufficient clothing. First, the evidence for the ephod's length is purely circumstantial, and based on the present passage, since in fact 'P' describes the composition of the garment but not its size. Second, as illustrated below, the motive for Michal's reaction is unclear, and many scholars do not believe it was self-exposure by David. Conversely, the references to 'eyes' in vv. 20, 22, and the possible revision of גלה to קלל in MT 2 Sam. 6.22, may allude to David's bareness. See 6.1.1.3.5.

Pope discusses genitalia, nudity and sexual activity, including measures to reduce offensive language through expurgation and euphemism.⁷⁶⁷ He does not mention 2 Samuel 6. Well-known passages related to these topics in Genesis–Kings are the story of Adam and Eve (Genesis 2-3), the story of Noah's nakedness (Gen. 9.20-27), and priestly material on illicit sexual practices (Leviticus 18, 20). Some scholars compare David's 'offence' with Saul's 'frenzy' in 1 Sam. 19.24, or with the 'tools' of the young men in 1 Sam. 21.6, or they contrast David's 'offence' with Saul's private 'evacuation' in 1 Sam. 24.4. Finally, some relate this passage to Pentateuchal statements in Exod. 20.26 and

⁷⁶⁴ Polzin 1993: 66; cf. Solvang 2003: 115 n. 66.

⁷⁶⁵ Baldwin 1988: 210-211; Gunn 1978: 74.

⁷⁶⁶ Exod. 20.26; Lev. 18.6-19; 20.11, 17-21; Isa. 47.3; Ezek. 16.36-37; 22.10; 23.10, 18, 29.

⁷⁶⁷ Pope 1992: 720-725.

38.42-43. However, whereas Bergen, for example, thinks David's dancing could not have exposed his nakedness and so violated the Torah requirement since he was wearing an ephod⁷⁶⁸, De Vaux, for example, thinks the stipulations regarding breeches (מכנסים) were invented precisely because of David's self-exposure in this passage.⁷⁶⁹

6.1.1.3 David's Words to Michal

David's reply to Michal in vv. 21-22 exhibits many text-critical difficulties in grammar and vocabulary. *MT* can be rendered:

And David said to Michal,
 Before Yahweh, ____ ____
 who chose me instead of your father and instead of all his house,
to appoint me ____ leader over the people of Yahweh, over Israel,
 and I made merry ____ before Yahweh,
 and I will be lightly esteemed still more than this,
 and I will be abased in my eyes,
 but with the maid-servants about whom you spoke, with them I will be
 honoured.⁷⁷⁰

The underlined words are problematic. In this writer's opinion, only the shaded words in the following layout comprise the original form of v. 21, which in the received tradition was expanded and then either corrupted or censored.

⁷⁶⁸ Bergen 1996: 303.

⁷⁶⁹ De Vaux 1953: 159.

⁷⁷⁰ The time-frame of the verbs in vv. 21-22 is difficult. Verse 20. נָכַבַּד and נָלַח, *qatal* forms, and the double occurrence of הָיָה, delimit the past-time context and the perfective viewpoint on David's activity. Verses 21-22. The cohortative אֲכַבְדָּה at the end of v. 22 has future reference. Preceding this future-referring verb are three *w^eqatal* verbs. The middle of the three verbs, וְנִקְלָחִי, is certainly future-referring due to the adjunct מִזֹּאת עוֹד ('again/still more than this'). The first and the third of the three verbs, וְהִיִּיתִי and וְשָׁחַקְתִּי, could have reference to either past- or future-time. Following וְנִקְלָחִי, and situated between it and the future referring אֲכַבְדָּה, וְהִיִּיתִי should be understood to have reference to future time. This leaves וְשָׁחַקְתִּי. The verb is generally translated as future in modern English translations (ASV, DRA, ESV, JPS, KJV, NAB, NASB, NIV, NJB, NKJV, RSV, TNK), but the NRSV has 'that I have danced before the LORD', and Fokkelman 1990: 380 concurs. The verb שָׁחַק in v. 21 makes reference to what David has already done, whereas the verbs in v. 22 refer to what will happen from this point onward. As a final note, some scholars take וְשָׁחַקְתִּי and what follows in v. 21 as the start of a verb sequence that continues on in v. 22, and some take this first step and then proceed to interpret the verb phrases as conditionals or interrogatives. Both approaches are unwarranted.

2	1	
	וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל מִיכָל	A
אֶרְקַד בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה	לִפְנֵי יְהוָה	B
	אֲשֶׁר בָּחַר בִּי מֵאֲבִיךָ וּמִכָּל בֵּיתוֹ	C
	לְצוֹת אֶתִּי נָגִיד עַל עַם יְהוָה עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל	D
וּרְקִדְתִּי	וּשְׁחַקְתִּי	E
	לִפְנֵי יְהוָה	F

- 1A, 1B and 1E (without the conjunction) constitute the original form of v. 21. 'And David said to Michal, "Before Yahweh I danced"'.
- 2B, 1C and 1D are a pre-LXX expansion in line with the pro-David/anti-Saul polemic. On one hand, 2B may have been lost in the MT due to homoioarcton thus resulting in an anacoluthon. 2B is still attested in the LXX. Following the loss of the verb רָקַד in 2B, הִרְקָדִים may have become הִרְקָם in v. 20. On the other hand, the absence of רָקַד in MT 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-21 may point to a systematic suppression of the term in the received version of David's transfer of the ark. See 6.1.1.3.4.
- 2E may be an independent LXX expansion derived from the occurrence of the same verb lexeme in 2B. Conversely, the minus of רָקַד in the MT may be accidental or intentional. See 6.1.1.3.4.
- 1F is a pre-LXX insertion together with 2B, 1C and 1D which replicates the earlier לִפְנֵי יְהוָה thus resuming the original story (Wiederaufnahme).

Text-critical information supporting this reconstruction is addressed below. The solution to this passage is the recognition that the Hebrew story underwent pre-LXX expansion (Veijola, Pisano, etc.) and then post-LXX corruption (Orlinsky, Nysse, etc.) or censorship (see 6.1.1.3.4). In this case, text-criticism explains one aspect of textual development, which is elucidated more fully through stylistic and literary analysis, especially the criticism of the blessing/oath formula and the content of the relative clause introduced by אֲשֶׁר.

6.1.1.3.1 2 Sam. 6.21

וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל-מִיכָל

At this point David replies to Michal. David is simply 'David' and Michal is simply 'Michal', as in 1 Sam. 19.12-17 right after she is introduced as David's wife. See 6.1.1.1.2. Why is the patronymic dropped? Clines says:

The answer can only be that purely literary factors outweigh the significative value of 'XbY', e.g. one may sense that the narrative here gathers pace, which the long form would slow down, or perhaps preferably that attention now focusses on David, who is the subject of the sentence, and that it is therefore beside the point to stress the role that Michal is playing.⁷⁷¹

6.1.1.3.2 2 Sam. 6.21

לפני יהוה

The clause at hand is closely tied to the final clause of this verse by its use of a lexeme for 'dance' and the adjunct לפני יהוה. The following layout facilitates the analysis of this material:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Before Yahweh	Verb	Blessing or Oath	Rel. Clause	(Conj. +) Verb(s)	Before Yahweh	Conj. + Verb (start v. 22)
MT	√	—	—	√	√	√	√
Targum	√	—	—	√	√	√	√
Peshitta	√	—	—	√	√	√	√
Jacob	√	—	—	√	√	—	√
LXX ^A	√	—	—	√	√	—	√
LXX ^B	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
LXX ^L	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Aquila	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Symmachus	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Theodoret	√	√	√	√	—	—	—
OL	√	—	√	√	√ (v. 22a)	√ (v. 22a)	√ (v. 22b)
Vulgate	√	—	—	√	√ (v. 22a)	—	√ (v. 22b)
Josephus	√ (?)	—	—	√	√	—	—

- Only 1, 4, 5 and 7 are textual constants.
- What is the significance of the double occurrence of 'before Yahweh'? Is the second instance a resumptive repetition?
- Why do the MT, Targum, Peshitta, Jacob, OL and Vulgate texts have an anacoluthon at the juncture between 1 and 4?
- Was 2 in the aforementioned texts lost or deleted or was it added to the other texts to ease the grammatical construction or for some other reason?
- Was 3 in the aforementioned texts (except in the OL) lost or omitted (together with 2) or was it added to the other texts together with or independent of the addition of 2?

⁷⁷¹ Clines 1991a: 128 (= Clines 1972: 272).

- Is 4 a gloss, related to the Wiederaufnahme with לפני יהוה?
- Are 5 and 6 original to the passage?
- Do 5 and 6 go grammatically with 1 (and 2) (resumptive?) or with 7?

The anacoluthon between 'before Yahweh' and the relative clause in MT is smoothed in most English translations by the insertion of 'it was' prior to the theological adverbial. Based on some of the Greek witnesses, many argue that 'I danced/I dance/I am dancing/I will dance' should be restored to the MT. There are four principal viewpoints regarding the material in 2B (ארקד ברוך יהוה) in the table at the start of 6.1.1.3. (1) Many restore both a verb phrase (רקד אני; אנכי מרקד; ארקד) and a blessing/oath formula (חי יהוה; ברוך יהוה). In their view לפני יהוה ארקד ברוך יהוה was lost from לפני יהוה ארקד ברוך יהוה when a scribe's eye jumped from the first to the second instance of יהוה. (2) Many restore a verb phrase but not a blessing/oath formula. (3) Hertzberg alone restores ברוך יהוה but not a verb phrase.⁷⁷² (4) Many do not emend the MT in any way. In their view, the MT was adjusted by the versions in order to relieve the anacoluthic grammar. Some holding this view think the material in the relative clause is a(n early) gloss, as shown by the anacoluthon and the Wiederaufnahme with לפני יהוה.

The second and third views are arbitrary. The fourth view is discredited by the intolerable inconsistency in logic in the MT. The view that both a verb phrase and a blessing/oath formula should be restored in the MT is argued by (among others) McCarter, Nysse, Orlinsky, Thenius, and Wellhausen.⁷⁷³ See 6.1.1.3.4. The aforementioned scholars correctly conclude on the basis of translation tendency that ὀρχήσονται reflects the *yiqtol* ארקד rather than a participle.

⁷⁷² Hertzberg 1964: 277.

⁷⁷³ McCarter 1984: 185-187; Nysse 1984: 450, 481; Orlinsky 1946: 26-29; Thenius 1842: 154; Wellhausen 1871: 169

The blessing formula εὐλογητὸς κύριος / *benedictus Dominus* = ברוך יהוה ('blessed be Yahweh') is attested in LXX^B and the OL. The oath formula ζῆ κύριος = חי יהוה ('as Yahweh lives') is attested in LXX^L. The scholars cited in the paragraph above are correct to conclude that ברוך יהוה rather than חי יהוה should be restored in the MT. The blessing formula is extended by the relative clause which *defines Yahweh's favour* toward David. The reading in LXX^L is likely assimilated to the more common phrase in Samuel, חי יהוה.⁷⁷⁴

If it is accepted that ברוך יהוה rather than חי יהוה is the original reading and that the phrase was lost or omitted from the MT (see 6.1.1.3.4), then the restoration of the phrase is significant. As observed already, ברוך is particularly important in 2 Samuel 6. In addition, the phrase ברוך יהוה occurs elsewhere in Samuel only in the stories about Nabal (1 Sam. 25.32, 39) and Absalom (2 Sam. 18.28). Saul, Nabal and Absalom are types of one another, each opposed to David.⁷⁷⁵ They are David's enemies (cf. אֵיב in 1 Sam. 25.22, 26, 29; 2 Sam. 18.29, 32). The stories in 1 Samuel 25 and 2 Samuel 18 intend to show that David relied on Yahweh (and was restrained by him), not taking matters into his own hands. David's relationships to these characters (enemies) never led to *his* violence. In each passage the text seems intent to prove David's lack of involvement and consequently his innocence. Saul is absent from both 1 Samuel 25 and 2 Samuel 18, but he is implicated as an enemy of David through the persons of Nabal and Absalom. Furthermore, ברוך יהוה is a response to the deaths of both these enemies. In 2 Samuel 6, David's ברוך יהוה is his response to Michal, the daughter of Saul, whom he supplanted as leader of Israel. Similarly, Saul's death is implicated in 2 Samuel 6.

⁷⁷⁴ The oath formula occurs in 1 Sam. 14.39, 45; 19.6; 20.3, 21; 25.26, 34; 26.10, 16; 28.10; 29.6; 2 Sam. 4.9; 12.5; 14.11; 15.21; 22.47.

⁷⁷⁵ See 2.1 and appendix 5.

The terms בחר and נגיד are significant. The relation of this clause to the story's pro-David/anti-Saul thrust is obvious. Many scholars consider this the only non-source material in the story of David's ark transfer. However, the gloss is attributed to very different hands. For example, it is:

- Pre-Deuteronomistic: Campbell, Campbell and O'Brien, Weinfeld.⁷⁷⁶
- From the Deuteronomist: McCarter, Peckham, Veijola.⁷⁷⁷
- From the 'Solomonic redactor': Vermeulen.⁷⁷⁸
- From the author of the 'History of David's Rise' (HDR): Mettinger.⁷⁷⁹

The evidence suggests that these and others correctly discern the 'secondary' or 'late' nature of the material in the relative clause. Textual instability surrounds and falls within this material. Furthermore, the grammatical repetition (deictic marker אשר), the rough syntax (anacoluthon), and the (lexical) resumptive repetition (Wiederaufnahme), are tell-tale signs of editorial activity. See 2.3.2.4.

First, אשר בחר־בי. The finite verb following the relative, as well as the expression of the object, are unremarkable as far as texts and grammar are concerned. From literary and theological perspectives, however, בחר is extremely significant.⁷⁸⁰ The verb occurs most often in Deuteronomy (31 times), Chronicles (26 times), Samuel (21 times), Isaiah (20 times), Kings (15 times) and Psalms (14 times). God as subject makes a choice for his people, Levites, kings, and Jerusalem. After 2 Sam. 6.21, in biblical narrative, the verb בחר is used to describe the establishment of a king only in 1 Kgs. 8.16 // 2 Chron. 6.6. In

⁷⁷⁶ Campbell 1986: 60; Campbell and O'Brien 2000: 289 (earlier than the 'Prophetic Record'); Weinfeld 1972: 335.

⁷⁷⁷ McCarter 1984: 187; 1994: 265 (Dtr¹); Peckham 1985: 92 (Dtr²); Veijola 1975: 66-68 (Dtr^G).

⁷⁷⁸ Vermeulen 2000: 232.

⁷⁷⁹ Mettinger 1976: 45.

⁷⁸⁰ The notions of election in general and the choice of a king in particular cannot possibly be addressed here.

both cases David is chosen. Elsewhere, Yahweh chooses Saul (1 Sam. 10.24; cf. 12.13⁷⁸¹) and rejects him (1 Sam. 15.23, 26; 16.1), and in his place he chooses David (implied in 1 Sam. 16.11-13; 2 Sam. 6.21) over his brothers (1 Sam. 16.7-10).⁷⁸² Reference is also made to David's election in 1 Kgs. 11.13, 34 and 1 Chron. 28.4.⁷⁸³ Finally, Yahweh chooses Solomon in 1 Chron. 28.5-6, 10; 29.1 (cf. 28.1-20.9).

Second, מאבִּיךָ ומכל־ביתו. The text and grammar are unremarkable. מִן means 'above, in preference to'.⁷⁸⁴ The house of Saul and its descendants, including Michal, are rejected by Yahweh.

Third, לִצֹּת אֶת־נֶגֶד. This phrase merits more discussion than is possible. The verb צֹח occurs nearly 500, but only 29 times in Samuel, and then as 'appoint' only for Yahweh's appointment of judges over Israel in 2 Sam. 7.11 and for Yahweh's appointment of David as נֶגֶד over Israel in 1 Sam. 13.14 ('over his people'); 25.30 ('over Israel'); and 2 Sam. 6.21 ('over Yahweh's people, over Israel'). Apart from the insignificant minus of τοῦ in LXX^B 2 Sam. 6.21, the Greek translation is striking due to the correspondence צֹח/καθίστημι. This is the only instance where the two verbs stand parallel to one another. In fact, the expected verb is ἐντέλλομαι, as in Aquila and Symmachus, where revision toward the received text is likely. Based on the consistent rendering of צֹח as ἐντέλλομαι in Greek Samuel (*in 26 of 27 cases elsewhere*⁷⁸⁵—including 1 Sam. 13.14 and 25.30), one must concur with McCarter that καταστήσαι

⁷⁸¹ MT 2 Sam. 21.6 is related to the issue at hand but space does not permit a discussion of the textual and literary issues.

⁷⁸² In 2 Sam. 16.18, Hushai ironically says to *Absalom* that he will remain loyal to the one whom Yahweh and his people have chosen—*David*!

⁷⁸³ The expression of the direct object is an interesting link between 2 Sam. 6.21 and 1 Chron. 28.4. Only in these verses does the first-person singular pronoun serve as the object of the verb בָּחַר.

⁷⁸⁴ BDB 582 (#6a).

⁷⁸⁵ The only other exception is 2 Sam. 7.11 with a form of τάσσω. Greek Samuel has phrase and verse minuses in 1 Sam. 2.29 and 17.20, respectively.

probably reflects לשום.⁷⁸⁶ The verb שים is commonly used for 'appointment' in the book of Samuel⁷⁸⁷ so that the use of צוה here makes a belatedly significant link with 1 Sam. 13.14 and 25.30.

Another text-critical issue is the double direct object in the MT (אחי נגיד) and the direct object plus prepositional object in Greek Samuel (με εἰς ἡγούμενον). On the bases of εἰς, ל preceding נגיד in about thirty Hebrew manuscripts, and 1 Sam. 13.14; 25.30, many emend the MT from נגיד to לנגיד. The double accusative of object and complement can be legitimately expressed as 'to appoint me leader' or 'to appoint me as/into leader', but the inclusion of the preposition is more common with this verb and also with other verbs in similar constructions.⁷⁸⁸ Unfortunately, a comprehensive evaluation of נגיד-texts renders it impossible to show on the basis of probability whether ל dropped off נגיד in the MT or whether εἰς was introduced into the Greek version.

The noun נגיד is significant for theological and literary studies of Davidic and Israelite kingship in the book of Samuel. It also figures heavily in redaction-historical views on the relative clause in 2 Sam. 6.21. The noun occurs 44 times: 21 times in Chronicles; seven times in Samuel⁷⁸⁹; four times in Kings; three times in Daniel; and nine times total in seven other books. נגיד is related to the verb נגד ('communicate, proclaim') and the substantive (used as preposition) נגד ('opposite'). The noun's range of meaning is 'chief, leader, prince, ruler, officer, official'. The Greek version generally translates with ἡγούμενος (26 times), followed in frequency by ἄρχων (8-9 times). The word is found both as a royal designation and as a general term for a leader, especially in Chronicles,

⁷⁸⁶ McCarter 1984: 186.

⁷⁸⁷ E.g.: (1) king: 1 Sam. 8.5; 10.19; (2) judicial figure(s): 1 Sam. 8.1; 2 Sam. 15.4; (3) military leader(s): 1 Sam. 8.12; 18.5, 13; 22.7; 28.2; 2 Sam. 17.25; 18.1; 23.23; (4) servants: 1 Sam. 8.11; 2 Sam. 12.31.

⁷⁸⁸ In theory, the thought in 2 Sam. 6.21 could have been expressed with a pronoun suffixed to the verb or the verb plus אה with a suffixed pronoun, standing for the first object; with or without ל + the infinitive construct of היה; and with or without ל preceding the second object: (ל)נגיד (להיות) (אחי or אחי-).

⁷⁸⁹ 1 Sam. 9.16; 10.1; 13.14; 25.30; 2 Sam. 5.2; 6.21; 7.8.

referring to governmental, military and religious leaders. Scholars frequently define נגיד in Samuel and Kings as the *king-designate or -elect* who is appointed by Yahweh to rule his people Israel. נגיד is widely but inconclusively discussed, and this is not the place to rehearse the etymology, meanings and potential developments in usage. Briefly, with regard to the latter issue, נגיד in 2 Sam. 6.21 has been interpreted to reflect either an early independent⁷⁹⁰ or later dependent⁷⁹¹ occurrence of the term. It is clear that נגיד was used in different traditions and at different times. The immediate concern is the noun's role in the polemic of Samuel. The point of David's statement to Michal is clear: David was designated נגיד in order to replace Saul the rejected king.

The terms מלך and נגיד are the cornerstone of Murray's *Divine Prerogative and Royal Pretension*. His thesis is that 2 Sam. 5.17-7.29 underscores the glaring difference of interests between David, who desires to be מלך, the monarchic lord over a subject people ('royal pretension'), and Yahweh, who instead desires a נגיד, the exemplary leader of Yahweh's people, chosen by Yahweh and subservient to his will ('divine prerogative').⁷⁹² Murray's interpretation of נגיד, which underpins his thesis, greatly misconstrues the role of נגיד in the book of Samuel. Ishida, among others, is right that an interpretation closer to king-designate or -elect makes better sense of the data.⁷⁹³ It is foretold in 1 Sam. 9.16 that Saul will be anointed נגיד and in 10.1 this is done (נגיד + משיח) by Samuel, and thereafter Saul is מלך (cf. 10.19, 24; etc.). Interestingly, Samuel says in 15.1, 17 that he had anointed (משיח) Saul as מלך. With respect to David it is said in 13.14 that he will be נגיד, and reference is again made to this fact in 25.30. Samuel anoints (משיח) David in 16.3, 12, 13, but no explicit reference is made to his נגיד-ship there. It is only after Saul's death (the

⁷⁹⁰ Campbell 1986: 60-61.

⁷⁹¹ Mettinger 1976: 44-45.

⁷⁹² In brief see Murray 1998: 245-246 and the critique in 1.2.

⁷⁹³ Ishida 1999: 57-67.

death of the anointed; 2 Sam. 1.21 [משח] that David can be anointed (משח) as מלך, and indeed this occurs in 2 Sam. 2.4 (cf. 2.7; 3.39). Interestingly, Nathan says in 12.7 that David had been anointed (משח) מלך, and the referent seems to be 1 Samuel 16 rather than 2 Samuel 2. In any case, after David's anointing in 2 Samuel 2 he is מלך, and the three subsequent references to David's נגיד-ship are expressed in terms of his relationship to Saul and his kingship: David's role as נגיד is explicitly situated in the literary and historical milieu of Saul in 2 Sam. 5.2 (// 1 Chron. 11.2); 2 Sam. 6.21; and 2 Sam. 7.8 (// 1 Chron. 17.7). מלך-ship and נגיד-ship are not roles which one could hold contemporaneously, since one is a forerunner to the other. These terms apply to different times in the office holder's reign. Thus it is not an issue of one or the other in 2 Samuel 6, between David's 'royal pretension' and Yahweh's 'divine prerogative'. Finally, 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23 is a story about the rejection of Saul and his house, and the reference to נגיד in this material is intended to highlight Yahweh's choice of David over Saul.

Fourth, על-עם יהוה על-ישראל. The evidence for the final phrase of v. 21 is:

MT, Targum, Peshitta	over		Yahweh's	people	over ⁷⁹⁴	Israel
Vulgate	over		Yahweh's	people		Israel
Jacob, LXX ^A , LXX ^B , Aquila, Symmachus	over		his	people	over	Israel
LXX ^L , OL	over		his	people		Israel
Theodoret	over	all	his	people		Israel

The MT is emended from עם יהוה to עמו by, among others, Budde, Dhorme, Jackson, McCarter and Nysse.⁷⁹⁵ Jackson suggests that the abbreviation for the divine name was read where only ׀, similar in form to ׀, originally stood.⁷⁹⁶ Another possibility is that an earlier 'his people' was intentionally altered to 'Yahweh's people'. Assuming the originality of עמו, who is the intended referent of the pronominal suffix? Does David

⁷⁹⁴ The variation regarding the presence or absence of the second preposition על/ἐπί is discussed in Nysse 1984: 273, 277.

⁷⁹⁵ Budde 1890: 232; Dhorme 1910: 325; Jackson 1962: 107, 113, 191; McCarter 1984: 186; Nysse 1984: 420-421.

⁷⁹⁶ Also see Tov 1997a: 137, 147-148.

mean that his appointment as נגיד over עַם יִשְׂרָאֵל was over 'His (Yahweh's) people Israel' or over 'his (Saul's) people Israel'? In fact, the nearest referents are 'your father' and 'his house', each clearly referring to Saul, whereas 'Yahweh' is more distant. This is one of two instances in Samuel where it is possible to give two very different interpretations to a coordinated עַם—יִשְׂרָאֵל phrase. The other is 2 Sam. 5.12, but the editors were not bothered by the potential attribution of עַם יִשְׂרָאֵל to David, as they were in the case of Saul.⁷⁹⁷

6.1.1.3.4 2 Sam. 6.21

ושחקתי לפני יהוה

The MT, Targum, Peshitta, and Vulgate, each with a single verb, are opposed by LXX^{ABL}, OL, Jacob, and Josephus, which have two.⁷⁹⁸ Some argue that καὶ ὀρχήσομαι (= ורקדתי) is added following καὶ παίξομαι on the basis of the earlier occurrence of ὀρχήσομαι (= ארקד). Others believe καὶ ὀρχήσομαι (= ורקדתי) was lost in the MT as a result of homoioteleuton. The doubly restored verb רקד in David's reply in v. 21 would be an appropriate response to restored הרקדים in Michal's rebuke in v. 20, just as the vocabulary of his response in v. 22 takes account of her vocabulary in v. 20.

The following table summarises the terminology related to 'dance' in the story of David's transfer of the ark.

⁷⁹⁷ See appendix 2. Elsewhere in Samuel, עַם may refer to the people of a particular locale, but the noun generally refers to 'the/these people (of Israel)' or to Yahweh's people phrased as 'my/your/his people'. It is remarkable that the people (of Israel) is David's in 2 Sam. 8.15; MT 2 Sam. 22.44; cf. 1 Sam. 27.12; but never Saul's, except perhaps in 1 Sam. 15.30, where ἐνώπιον πρεσβυτέρων Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐνώπιον λαοῦ μου in Greek Samuel stands parallel to נגד זקני־עמי ונגד ישראל in the MT. In contrast to 'the elders of Israel' elsewhere in Samuel (1 Sam. 4.3; 8.4; 2 Sam. 3.17; 5.3; 17.4, 15), does 'the elders of my people' seek in some way to narrow the application of the *nomen rectum*?

⁷⁹⁸ The material within brackets in the following text was lost in LXX^A as a consequence of homoioteleuton: v. 21 καὶ παίξομαι καὶ ὀρχήσομαι [ἐνώπιον κυρίου v. 22 καὶ ἀποκαλυφθήσομαι] ἔτι οὕτως ...

	MT Samuel	LXX Samuel	MT Chronicles	LXX Chronicles
2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.8	משחקים	παίζοντες	משחקים	παίζοντες
2 Sam. 6.13 // 1 Chron. 15.26 (cf. 5.1.3.3)	צעדים	χοροί = מחלות	–	–
2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27 (cf. 5.1.3.6-7)	מכרכר	ἀνεκρούετο	מכרבל	περιεζωσμένος
2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 (cf. 6.1.1.1.3)	מפוז ומכרכר	ὀρχούμενον καὶ ἀνακρουόμενον - prefixed παίζοντα in LXX ^L - inverted order in LXX ^A	מרקד ומשחק	ὀρχούμενον παίζοντα
2 Sam. 6.20b (cf. 6.1.1.2.3)	הרקים	τῶν ὀρχουσμένων = הרקדים	–	–
2 Sam. 6.21	ושחקתי	ὀρχήσομαι = ארקד καὶ παίξομαι καὶ ὀρχήσομαι = ורקדתי	–	–

The textual stability in Chronicles is outdone only by the reference to רקד/ὀρχέομαι in this book and the *fourfold use* of the terminology in Michal's rebuke and David's reply in *Greek Samuel*. The absence of רקד in MT 2 Sam. 6.16 and 6.20b is suspicious. See 6.1.1.1.3 and 6.1.1.2.3. Scholars offer conflicting explanations for the absence of רקד in MT 2 Sam. 6.21. See 6.1.1.3 and 6.1.1.3.2. On one hand, the phrases יהוה ברוך יהוה and לפני יהוה and ושחקתי may have dropped accidentally following יהוה ברוך יהוה and ורקדתי respectively. On the other hand, ארקד and ורקדתי may have been deleted, in which case יהוה ברוך יהוה was also omitted since יהוה ברוך יהוה אשר... would be unwieldy.

The assertion that in v. 16 the Chronicler substituted רקד for פוז on the basis that the latter was unused in his day is questionable. The verb פוז appears elsewhere only in Gen. 49.24, but רקד is hardly an appropriate replacement. Apart from 1 Chron. 15.29, the verb רקד occurs eight times in the Bible. The usage is neutral in Qoh. 3.4 (where

interestingly רקד is parallel to שחק), but in Job 21.11 רקד is an activity of the children of the wicked, and elsewhere the verb is only used for the 'dance' of animals.⁷⁹⁹

With these points in mind, were מחלות in v. 13 and רקד in vv. 6.16, 20b-21 methodically squelched in the received tradition of 2 Samuel 6?⁸⁰⁰ The editors of MT Samuel may have sought to erase any potentially negative links between David and other biblical characters, or perhaps they were discontent with the dance activity in the procession in general. The breadth of meaning in שחק (vv. 5, 21) and the rarity of כרר (vv. 14, 16) and פזו (v. 16) may operate to safeguard David's character by obscuring his activity, just as צעדים (v. 13) links the king's and the deity's accomplishments, and just as הרקים (v. 20b) may denigrate Michal's sensibility vis-à-vis the king.⁸⁰¹ In this scenario, Chronicles retains the more original vocabulary for David's activity: שחק (13.8; 15.29) and רקד (15.29).⁸⁰² In any case, the history of the biblical text is markedly unsure and unclear in 2 Sam. 6.13, 14, 16 // 1 Chron. 13.9; 15.27, 29 and in 2 Sam. 6.20b-21. This observation in and of itself is significant. We must ask why such a dense haze hovers over David's behaviour? Were ancient editors and scribes somewhat like Michal, bothered perhaps by what David did before Yahweh? The state of the biblical texts may reflect this struggle.

The theological adverbial לפני יהוה is attested at the start of 2 Sam. 6.21 in all witnesses and at the end of the verse in all witnesses except for Jacob (partially with

⁷⁹⁹ Isa. 13.21; Joel 2.5; Nah. 3.2; Ps. 29.6; Ps. 114.4, 6.

⁸⁰⁰ Analogous substitutions may be observable in MT 1 Kgs. 1.40 // LXX 1 Kgs. 1.40 (LXX^L 25.40) (Solomon's coronation procession) and in MT 1 Kgs. 20.14 // LXX 1 Kgs. 21.15 (Ahab's struggles with Ben-hadad). Interestingly, observe the role of the prophet in each story. Indeed, Schenker 2003 argues that dancing men were edited out of the MT in these three stories.

⁸⁰¹ Berlin 1983: 72-73 links the alternative expressions for what Michal sees in 2 Sam. 6.16 ('leaping and whirling; מפזו ומכרכר') to *her exaggerated perspective* on David. In other words, מפזו ומכרכר reflects Michal's point of view.

⁸⁰² Murray 1998: 64 is mistaken to suppose that *both* שחק and רקד in 1 Chron. 15.29 point to their original inclusion in 2 Sam. 6.21 with שחק and with *restored* רקד.

סו.לכח.ס), LXX^A (due to haplography), and the Vulgate. It is suggested above that the second לפני יהוה is a resumptive repetition following the editorial insertion of the long relative clause. Although this repetition plays an editorial role it is noteworthy that *this particular adjunct* both begins and ends David's rejoinder to Michal's criticism. The distribution of לפני יהוה in Samuel, the concentration of the phrase in 2 Samuel 6, and the repetition of the phrase in this verse and at its boundaries, are not by chance.⁸⁰³ David acts by Yahweh's favour, relies on Yahweh, and acts 'before Yahweh' and not before anybody else—neither the slave girls of David's servants (as Michal says), nor Michal, nor Israel. Indeed, the entire exchange between Michal and David (vv. 20b-22) moves toward the Yahwistic claim at the centre⁸⁰⁴:

Michal:	honor
	maids
	shamelessly
David:	<i>before Yahweh</i>
	chose me above ... above
	prince over
	<i>before Yahweh</i>
	contemptible
	maids
	honor

Finally, Murray makes לפני יהוה 'the most salient element' in David's retort:

In such pompous terms David repudiates Michal's right to have any view on his behaviour. For her regal disdain of his actions amounts to disdain of Yahweh to whom alone, he proclaims, they are directed. Hence her scorn for David as king is in fact a defiant scorn for Yahweh who gave him his position.⁸⁰⁵

⁸⁰³ See 3.1.4.1 (2 Sam. 6.5), 5.1.3.5 (2 Sam. 6.17), 5.1.3.6 (2 Sam. 6.14), 6.1.1.1.3 (2 Sam. 6.16), and appendix 2.

⁸⁰⁴ Brueggemann 1990: 252.

⁸⁰⁵ Murray 1998: 142, 144.

The MT reading is an N form of the verb קלל.⁸⁰⁶ MT's ונקלתי is attested in all witnesses excluding the LXX (καὶ ἀποκαλυφθήσομαι) and OL (*et denudabor*) whose readings suppose ונגליתי ('and I will reveal/uncover myself'). Many neglect to address this variation, thereby assuming MT's originality, and opinions vary among those who do discuss the variation. Two arguments favour the originality of ונקלתי: (1) גלה can be 'impeached as reminiscent' of its threefold occurrence in v. 20, i.e., assimilation.⁸⁰⁷ (2) קלל at the start and כבד at the end of v. 22 'makes a rhetorically forceful contrastive inclusio'.⁸⁰⁸ In contrast, three arguments favour the originality of ונגליתי: (1) גלה indeed goes back to v. 20 since David answers Michal's objections with her own words. (2) גלה corresponds well with the references to 'eyes' in vv. 20, 22. (3) גלה can be taken as offensive, since bareness is generally regarded as shameful in the Bible, and it is well known that elsewhere scribes altered MT to conceal offensive language.⁸⁰⁹ See 6.1.1.2.3.

Under the assumption that the editors of Hebrew Samuel revised the text in order to 'lighten' the forcefulness and forthrightness of David's intention to expose himself still more, why did they replace גלה with the particular lexeme קלל? The following observations are relevant. (1) The verb קלל is used 82 times, most often in Samuel (16 times), and never in a synoptic text.⁸¹⁰ (2) The verb קלל has an antithetical relationship to כבד and these verbs and/or their cognates are closely associated in a number of passages, including 1 Sam. 2.8, 29-30; 6.5-6; 2 Sam. 6.20, 22.⁸¹¹ (3) Interestingly, קלל and כבד appear together in 1 Sam. 2.30 and 2 Sam. 6.16, 22. By despising David Michal

⁸⁰⁶ G: 'be slight, swift, trifling'; N: 'show oneself swift, appear trifling, be lightly esteemed'.

⁸⁰⁷ McCarter 1984: 186.

⁸⁰⁸ Murray 1998: 66.

⁸⁰⁹ Pope 1992: 722; Revell 1992: 1011-1012.

⁸¹⁰ 1 Sam. 2.30; 3.13; 6.5; 17.43; 18.23; 2 Sam. 1.23; 6.22; 16.5, 7, 9, 10 (twice), 11, 13; 19.22, 44.

⁸¹¹ Other passages are 1 Kgs. 12.4, 9-11, 14 // 2 Chron. 10.4, 9-11, 14; Isa. 8.23; 23.8-9; 49.5-6; Hab. 2.14, 16; Prov. 26.1-2.

despises Yahweh, before whom David acts, and whose presence David brings to Jerusalem. Brueggemann says:

David, who is thought to be despised by Michal, is in fact honored in Israel and by Yahweh. Michal, who thinks she is in a position of strength, is dismissed by the narrative as barren and hopeless. There is something here of the exalted being humbled and the humbled being exalted ... David is indeed the one who humbles himself and who, by the power of God, is exalted. The text remembers and enacts the strange singing of Hannah (I Sam. 2:7-8).⁸¹²

6.1.1.3.6 2 Sam. 6.22

והייתי שפל בעיני

The evidence for the adjective is unremarkable. Although ἀχρεῖος ('useless, unfit, unprofitable') occurs in the Septuagint only here and in the Epistle of Jeremiah, and although the adjective ταπεινός ('lowly, humble') or a cognate is a superior (cf. Aquila and Symmachus) and more frequent translation equivalent of שפל and its cognates, the Greek reading does not suggest a different *Vorlage*.

The adjective שפל ('deep, low'; 'humble, humiliated, lowly') occurs 17 times but only here in Samuel. English translations of this verse use the words 'base, abased, lowly, humble, humiliated', and commentators construe David's demeanour as a virtue: positive humiliation or pious self-effacement. With reference to people the word generally focuses on worth or status, and the dominant use of the root refers to Yahweh's threat or promise that the arrogant or haughty will be brought low, cast down, or humbled.⁸¹³

It is noteworthy that the root שפל occurs three times in Samuel: the verb שפל in the poetry of 1 Sam. 2.7 and 2 Sam. 22.28, and the adjective שפל in 2 Sam. 6.22. The distribution of the root in Samuel is hardly coincidental and makes a forceful point

⁸¹² Brueggemann 1990: 253.

⁸¹³ G. A. Long 1997: 224.

regarding David vis-à-vis Michal and her father. The Songs of Hannah and David conclude saying⁸¹⁴:

- 1 Sam. 2.10 'Yahweh! His adversaries shall be shattered; the Most High will thunder in heaven. Yahweh will judge the ends of the earth; he will give strength to his king, and exalt the power of his anointed'.
2 Sam. 22.51 'He is a tower of salvation for his king, and shows steadfast love to his anointed, to David and his descendants forever'.

The phrase 'in the eyes of' grammatically and conceptually modifies only the immediately preceding verb, and although the phrase may refer to sight or judgment (= thought; cf. English 'in my view') it generally means 'in the opinion of'. Is the original phrase בעיני ('in my eyes') as in the MT, Targum, Peshitta, the first instance in Jacob⁸¹⁵, and the Vulgate, or is it בעיניך ('in your eyes') as suggested by the OG, Aquila, Symmachus, and the OL? Translators and commentators are divided. Some reject the Greek reading⁸¹⁶ whereas just as many believe it is original.⁸¹⁷ The arguments based on sense alone are fragile, leading in one or another direction depending on the interpreter's understanding of the passage. For one the Greek rendering gives an appropriate sense while for another it ruins it. There are no persuasive arguments in favour of either בעיני or בעיניך.

The form בעיני is attested in one medieval Hebrew manuscript as noted in *BHS*. Indeed, a reference to Yahweh not only makes excellent sense, but it also provides a reasonable explanation for the other two traditions, which are clearly primitive.⁸¹⁸ Who could allow to remain a provocatively *original* reference to Yahweh in a text in which *originally* David exposed himself (גלה) before *him*? Michal accuses David of dishonour

⁸¹⁴ See Brueggemann 1990: 20-21, 339-345; Childs 1979: 272-273.

⁸¹⁵ The Targum, Peshitta and the first instance in Jacob have 'in the eyes of my soul'.

⁸¹⁶ Barthélemy 1982: 244; Wellhausen 1871: 170.

⁸¹⁷ Driver 1890: 273; Thenius 1842: 154.

⁸¹⁸ Ackroyd 1977: 71; Mauchline 1971: 226; and McCarter 1984: 186 believe the original phrase was בעיני ידוה. Bruno 1935: 99 suggests the implausible

before the slave girls, and David replies: 'My "lowly" behaviour is before Yahweh, and so it will continue, because he elevates me; as for you (and all for which you stand), I actually prefer the slave girls!'

6.1.1.3.7 2 Sam. 6.22

וְעֵינַיִהָאֲמַהוּת אֲשֶׁר אָמַרְתָּ עִמָּם אֲכַבְדָּהּ

This clause is disjunctive contrastive and the point in *MT* is this: David will carry on with what he views as 'lowly' behaviour, but with the slave girls he will be honoured. The contrast is principally between David and the slave girls, and more specifically between David's behaviour as he views it and the reaction of the slave girls to the king. Many interpreters see a contrast between Michal and the slave girls, but this is explicitly true only if *MT* Samuel is emended according to *LXX* Samuel in the previous clause (i.e., 'my eyes' is changed to 'your eyes'). However, since Michal's reproach in v. 20 implicitly sets her and the slave girls in contrast, it is assumed that David's response in v. 22, in which he alludes to v. 20 and sides with the slave girls, is also an implicit affirmation of inequality between them and her. From this perspective, then, it is true that Michal and the slave girls are thrown in parallel and that their 'respect' shall compensate David for her contempt.

The relative clause, 'about whom you spoke', is uncomplicated, but the following word is not. The suffix in עִמָּם is 3mp whereas its referent הָאֲמַהוּת is 3fp. Many address the function of עִמָּם within its clause as well as the repetition of עַם in this verse, but few point out the discrepancy in gender⁸¹⁹, and this silence is remarkable since many consider the replacement of second and third person plural feminine suffixes by their masculine equivalents a 'late' Hebrew feature.⁸²⁰ Within its clause the prepositional phrase עִמָּם

⁸¹⁹ W. R. Arnold 1917: 67.

⁸²⁰ See appendix 3. As expected, the Targum has בְּעֵינֵיהֶן and the Peshitta and Jacob have ܥܡܗܝܢ.

functions as 'before, in the sight of, almost = in the judgement of' according to Driver⁸²¹, and Williams labels this the 'consciousness' usage of ע. ⁸²² The significance of the repetition is discussed in 6.1.1.4.1.

Rather than a counterpart to עמם, the LXX *seems* to have in this slot the 1cs accusative pronoun με, and the OL reads the same, although the function of the pronoun is different. ⁸²³ The translators of Samuel consistently render ע with a suffixed pronoun using μετά with a genitive pronoun, thus suggesting that they would have written μετ' αὐτῶν if עמם had been in the *Vorlage*. Alternatively, the OG translators may have ignored the resumptive ע with its suffixed pronoun in order to streamline the sentence, as they may have done in the case of לה in v. 23 as well. However, the MT and LXX grammar is different: עמם is a prepositional adjunct to אכבדה whereas με is the accusative subject of the infinitive δοξασθῆναι. The subject in the 1cs verb אכבדה is clear, but not in the infinitive δοξασθῆναι, which requires the explicit mention of the subject by means of an accusative pronoun. Thus με does *not really* fall in the same slot as עמם, and the Greek version actually attests a minus of עמם, as does the Vulgate: *et cum ancillis de quibus locuta es gloriosior apparebo* ('and with the slave girls, about whom all was said, [~~with them~~] I will appear more glorious'). The Vulgate regularly agrees with the MT against the LXX, so its divergence in this matter is significant. Either the LXX and Vulgate represent streamlined texts, as suggested by Nysse, or the MT (and Targum, Peshitta and Jacob) is revised to include the repetitious 'with them', and this is significant from a literary standpoint. See 6.1.1.4.1.

⁸²¹ Driver 1890: 273.

⁸²² Williams 1976: §337, p. 58.

⁸²³ The OL says *et cum puellis cum quibus dixisti me nudatum glorificabor*, which can be rendered 'and with the girls, with whom you said I was nude, I will be glorified'. Either *ad me* or *mihi* would have been used to say '(with whom you said) to me'.

The verb phrases are:

- 'Let me be honoured' (MT), with cohortative אֶכְבֹּד.
- 'I will be honoured' (Targum, Peshitta).
- 'I will be honoured and praised' (Jacob).
- 'I will be glorified' (OL).
- 'I will appear more glorious' (Vulgate).
- 'I was glorified' (LXX), with με δοξασθῆναι.

The readings in all versions except the LXX represent an independent statement: 'I will ...', whereas in the Greek version the verb phrase is dependent on the previous clause: 'And I will again reveal/uncover myself thus, *and I will be useless* (a) in your eyes *and* (b) with the slave girls of (= by?) whom you said I was glorified/held in honour'.⁸²⁴ The insertion of μή prior to the infinitive in many Greek manuscripts does not suggest a different reading in the *Vorlage*, but only that at some point the Greek translation was misunderstood. The MT's cohortative also diverges from the remainder of the witnesses. Driver believes the MT should be emended to אֶכְבֹּד since the context requires a conviction rather than a wish⁸²⁵, but most scholars reject this suggestion, sometimes citing Yahweh's אֶכְבֹּד-statement in Exod. 14.4, 17, which is surely a conviction rather than a mere wish. אֶכְבֹּד provides emphasis vis-à-vis אֶכְבֹּד.⁸²⁶ Nevertheless, suitability does not mean originality, and the MT may have been revised from אֶכְבֹּד to אֶכְבֹּד to emphasise David's resolve.

6.1.1.4 The Narrator's Summary of Michal's Childlessness

6.1.1.4.1 2 Sam. 6.23

וְלִמְיָכֵל בְּתִשְׁאוֹל לֹא הָיָה לָהּ יֶלֶד עַד יוֹם מוֹתָהּ

2 Sam. 6.23 is succinct and devoid of textual difficulties yet prompts more questions than it answers (see 6.1.2), and these facts are significant. Textual variation may suggest that scribes and editors attempted to explicate or alleviate perceived

⁸²⁴ McCarter 1984: 186.

⁸²⁵ Driver 1890: 273.

⁸²⁶ GKC §108b, p. 319.

difficulties in the story. Alternatively, the absence of evidence for textual manipulation in a cryptic line such as 2 Sam. 6.23 may indicate that scribes and editors were not bothered by a particular incident or comment, or rather, the absence may indicate that they were unsure of its meaning or preferred to leave their viewpoint unknown or ambiguous.

What is the cause of Michal's childlessness? Is it to be found in the deity, David, Michal, or elsewhere? Suggested answers are⁸²⁷:

- The cause is the deity. Yahweh closed Michal's womb. He cursed her. Her childlessness is the result of barrenness. In the biblical world barrenness is considered a curse from God, the greatest of misfortunes, resulting in labels like disgrace, dishonour, humiliation, reproach, shame, etc. This is the dominant reading in the rabbinic period, but many scholars still take this view.
- The cause is David. He refused her. He wished to punish her. This is the dominant reading in the modern era.
- The cause is the deity and David. The curse on Michal was David's denial of her. Divine judgment worked through natural channels. Ackroyd and Caird offer this interpretation.⁸²⁸
- The cause is Michal. She refused him. She wished to punish him, perhaps politically as well. No interpreter holds this view, but Clines and Exum ponder the possibility.⁸²⁹
- The cause is mutual separation between David and Michal. Statements such as 'broken marriage', 'personal estrangement', 'breakdown in marital relations', 'collapse of dialogue' or 'less of a dispossession than a deadlock' are applicable. This is the view of Baldwin, Bright, Rosenberg and Vos.⁸³⁰
- The cause is barrenness, but rather than a curse, her barrenness is 'bitter coincidence' or 'the last painful twist of a wronged woman's fate'. This possibility is raised by Alter.⁸³¹
- The cause is ambiguous or unknowable, or perhaps it is one of the above. This 'I'm unsure' or 'I don't know' view is given in more than a dozen commentaries.
- In fact, Michal *did* have a child—five to be exact. Several scholars are reluctant to emend MT 2 Sam. 21.8. In addition, a passage in the Talmud,

⁸²⁷ Fishkin 1988: 65-72 is a good review.

⁸²⁸ Ackroyd 1977: 71; Caird 1953: 1082.

⁸²⁹ Clines 1991c: 139; Exum 1991: 185; 1992: 88.

⁸³⁰ Baldwin 1988: 211; Bright 1981: 208; Rosenberg 1986: 117-118; Vos 1983: 117.

⁸³¹ Alter 1981: 125; 1991: 73.

Sanhedrin 21a: 20-21, 25-26, says Michal had children on the day of her death. See 6.1.2.

This analysis treats this verse according to its natural divisions: (a) 'and to Michal the daughter of Saul'; (b) 'there was not (to her) a child'; (c) 'to/until the day of her death'.

First, 'and to Michal the daughter of Saul' (וּלְמִיכָל בַּת־שָׁאֵל). Following the heated dialogue between David and Michal, and bringing to an end the story of David's transfer of the ark, one might expect the final comment to overtly relate to the preceding material in some explanatory manner. That is, one might expect a sequential verb form, such as a *wayyiqtol*, or perhaps an adverb such as 'therefore', but this is the case only in the Latin versions (*igitur*). Instead, the final comment dangles from the story, and the final mention of Michal is suspended within the comment. Why doesn't this verse begin, for example, ילד ולא היה למיכל ילד or ויהי/והיה למיכל אין ילד? Through grammatical disjunction or dislocation together with *casus pendens* the text lacks a lucid relation to the preceding material and Michal—that is, 'Michal, the daughter of Saul'—is placed in the limelight. In linguistic jargon *she*—that is, 'Michal, the daughter of Saul'—is fronted or topicalised. This clause is about 'Michal, the daughter of Saul': to her, no, to *them*, there was no descendant.

Second, 'there was not (to her) a child' (לֹא־הָיָה לָהּ יֶלֶד). The resumptive pronoun on the preposition ל refers to the dislocated לְמִיכָל and helps 'lighten' the sentence.⁸³² It is impossible to determine whether לָהּ was added to the received tradition or whether the Greek translator left it untranslated. The distribution and usage of the root ילד in Samuel is unremarkable except to note the nearness of the terminology in 2 Sam. 3.2, 5 and 5.13-14.⁸³³ See below. Also, if Michal's childlessness is the result of the deity's curse, it should be observed that other terminology was available for expressing the notion of barrenness.

⁸³² Driver 1890: 274.

⁸³³ On the *Kethib* ילד / *Qere* וילד see the grammars, commentaries and De Rossi 1785: II, 169.

גלמוד 'hard, barren, unproductive'	Job 15.34; cf. Isa. 49.21; Job. 3.7; 30.3
עקר 'barren'	Gen. 11.30 (Sarai); 25.21 (Rebekah); 29.31 (Rachel; cf. 30.22); Exod. 23.26; Deut. 7.14; Judg. 13.2-3 (wife of Manoah); 1 Sam. 2.5 (Hannah); Ps. 113.9; Job 24.21; cf. Isa. 54.1
ערירי 'childless'	Gen. 15.2 (Abraham); Lev. 20.20-21; Jer. 22.30 (Coniah)
עצר רחם 'barren womb'	Prov. 30.16
עצר	Isa. 66.9
יהוה עצר/סגר רחם 'Yahweh closed the womb'	(Gen 20.18; women of Abimelech); ויהוה סגר רחמה (1 Sam. 1.5; Hannah); כִּי־סָגַר (1 Sam. 1.6; Hannah)
לא ילד	Gen. 16.1 (Sarai); 30.1 (Rachel; cf. 30.22); Judg. 13.2-3 (wife of Manoah); Isa. 23.4; 54.1; Job 24.21
אין/לא בן/ילד	ויהי לפננה (Num. 3.4; Nadab and Abihu); ובנים לא־היו להם (2 Sam. 6.23; Michal); לא־היה לה ילד (1 Sam. 1.2; Hannah); לא בני (1 Chron. 2.30, 32; Seled and Jether); ובנים לא־היו להם (1 Chron. 24.2; Nadab and Abihu). In these passages בן probably refers to 'sons' only.

See below.

Third, 'to/until the day of her death' (עד יום מותה). The phrase עד יום מות is infrequent: Judg. 13.7; 1 Sam. 15.35; 2 Sam. 6.23; 20.3 (מות is the infinitive construct); 2 Kgs. 15.5; Jer. 52.11, 34; 2 Chron. 26.21. It cannot be demonstrated that in 2 Sam. 6.23 the phrase means 'She had no child until the day of her death, but on the day of her death she did'. This thought would be expressed using ביום מותה or something similar. It is extremely unlikely that the phraseology of 2 Sam. 6.23 and 20.3 is coincidental (see below).

2 Sam. 6.23	ולמיכל בת־שאול לא־היה לה ילד עד יום מותה
2 Sam. 20.3	ויבא דוד אל־ביתו ירושלם ויקח המלך את עשר־נשים פלגשים אשר הניח לשמר הבית ויהנם בית־משמרת ויכלכלם ואליהם לא־בא ותהיינה צררות עד־יום מתן אלמנות חיות

The emphasis in 2 Sam. 6.23 rests on *the fact* of Michal's childlessness, not the reason for it. This clause is about 'Michal, the daughter of Saul'—to her, no, to *them*, there was no descendant. The passage oozes pro-Davidic/anti-Saulide sentiment. The royal

lineage of Saul has come to an end. Furthermore, the passage at hand follows closely after 2 Sam. 3.2-5 and 5.13-16, which share לָדָד-terminology. Michal is unlike David's other wives. He impregnated them, but not her!⁸³⁴

The cause of Michal's childlessness is ambiguous, or perhaps it should be called open-ended. Josipovici correctly states that our interpretation depends on how we read the book of Samuel as a whole.⁸³⁵ Amazingly, very few scholars offer evidence in support of one view or another. Some suggested evidence is:

- It is Yahweh: Yahweh blesses obedience with a fruitful womb (e.g., Exod. 23.26; Deut. 7.14; 28.11). Only Yahweh can open and close the womb (e.g., Gen. 20.18; 29.31; 30.2, 22; 1 Sam. 1.5-6; Isa. 66.9).
- It is Yahweh: Hannah's barrenness is explicitly caused by Yahweh, and lexical and conceptual links between 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Samuel 1–2 indicate that he is also to blame for Michal's situation.
- It is Yahweh: (Perhaps) Michal's barrenness is Yahweh's intervention to fulfil the prophecy of Samuel in 1 Sam. 13.13-14.
- It is Yahweh: V. 23 should be construed as referring to the motif of curse, since it is put in contrast to v. 20a referring to that of blessing.
- It cannot be Yahweh: At the points in the Bible when a woman is clearly barren a formulaic expression appears which clearly implicates God as the opener and closer of wombs. This is near the truth, but not precisely. Sometimes the text does identify God as the culprit (e.g., יְהוָה סָגַר רַחֲמָיו) but other times barrenness is simply reported without comment on its cause. See below.
- It cannot be David: David does not cease conjugal relations with Michal, since this would be expressed differently, e.g., וְלֹא־יָסַף עוֹד לְדַעְתָּהּ in Gen. 38.26.

These explanations are unpersuasive, mostly because close examination reveals that they are too general, arbitrary, or rely on loose associations. The following three arguments, however, validate the interpretation that David intentionally set Michal aside. First,

⁸³⁴ R. G. Bowman 1991: 117; Cartledge 2001: 442; also Carlson 1964: 58; Hamilton 2001: 314; Polzin 1993: 71.

⁸³⁵ Josipovici 1988: 22-23.

Driver speaks of 'the resumption for the sake of emphasis' in 'עַם ... עַם' in v. 22⁸³⁶, and Fishkin argues that the redundant usage has significant interpretative implications: '... It conveys a harshness on David's part; he is cruelly rubbing the reality of Michal's situation in her face ...'.⁸³⁷ Second, a careful examination of biblical cases of barrenness shows that לֹא-הָיָה לָהּ יָלֵד should not be construed to implicate barrenness or divine veto in the absence of a lexeme for 'barren' (e.g., עֲקָרָה) in the nearby context or a statement that the deity did indeed intervene. Third, as observed above, the phraseology of 2 Sam. 6.23 and 20.3 is hardly coincidental. This association, mentioned by a few scholars⁸³⁸, clinches the case: Michal was treated like the members of the royal harem, who were first abandoned (15.16), then raped (16.21-22), and finally confined (20.3). Why, then, is the connection made so vaguely? Fishkin says:

The implied literary-critical argument here is that the lexical echo (Heb. '*ad yom motah/n*'), implies a similarity also in semantic value and therefore in the narrative situation of the characters ... In this view, Michal receives similar treatment at the hands of David as did the concubines, whose fates however, are spelled out plainly in the text. ... It remains to be asked, however, *why* the text is so reticent on this important issue. ... I would ... argue the possibility that the silence of the text in 6:23 may indicate not only the text's 'unease' about David's role in her childlessness, but also a discomfort with Michal's larger fate and an unwillingness, for ideological and theological reasons, to clearly define David's role in that fate. For I argue that the narrator hints at the subtext--the 'reality' of Michal's fate--precisely by providing us with the echo of 20:3, which does fully explain the cruel situation of the concubines. Even if David's only offense were his willfully causing Michal's childlessness, it is no surprise that the text would exhibit a reluctance clearly to implicate the Lord's anointed king of Israel. And all the more so if she--his royal wife--received the kind of treatment at his hands which is poignantly described for the concubines in 20:3--if she were condemned by him to a life of childlessness, dishonor, and caged isolation. This is perhaps the real reason for the textual 'unease' which Exum notes. *The text wants to, but cannot, express the cruelty of Michal's fate, and the nature of David's role in that fate.* But it simultaneously hints at what it represses in 6:23 by providing us with a textual clue to the 'narrative truth': a sad echo of ten more who were widowed alive and imprisoned by David.⁸³⁹

⁸³⁶ Driver 1890: 273-274.

⁸³⁷ Fishkin 1988: 94-95.

⁸³⁸ Abramsky, cited by Eskenazi 1991: 172-173; Budde 1890: 232; De Vaux 1953: 160; Exum 1991: 191; 1992: 170; Fishkin 1988: 72-74; Fokkelman 1990: 205; Halpern 2001: 33, 313; Kennedy 1900: 223.

⁸³⁹ Fishkin 1988: 72, 74.

Michal, *the daughter of Saul*, the former king, was not permitted to have children, to provide a successor to the throne of Israel. *Queen Michal, the wife of King David*, was shut up until the day of her death, living as if in widowhood. Scribes and editors backed David's socio-political agenda—a Davidic Judahite king is superior to a Saulide Benjaminite king—but they were not quite able to content themselves with King David's role in sealing Michal's fate.⁸⁴⁰

6.1.2 Literary Analysis

Space forbids additional discussion of the meanings of the name and patronymic of Michal; the motif of the woman in the window in biblical literature and extra-biblical resources; the themes of sexual activity and progeny in Samuel; the themes of 'respect, honour, acceptance' and 'contempt, shame, rejection' in Samuel; and studies of gender politics in biblical literature and ancient Israel and the role of women in the book of Samuel.⁸⁴¹ A very interesting passage which cannot be examined in detail in this thesis is MT 2 Sam. 21.8, which speaks of the '... the five sons of Michal the daughter of Saul, whom she bore to Adriel the son of Barzillai the Meholathite'. The widespread 'solution'

⁸⁴⁰ Beyond the similar topic, and the occurrence of *עַד יוֹם מוֹתוֹ*, it has gone unnoticed that elsewhere in the book of Samuel David is 'in' or 'on' his house, but only three times does he 'go' (*הֵלֵךְ*, *בֹּא*) or 'return' (*שׁוּב*) to his house: *וַיֵּשֶׁב דָּוִד לְבֵרֶךְ אֶת־בֵּיתוֹ* (2 Sam. 6.20; Michal); *וַיָּבֹא אֶל־בֵּיתָהּ* (2 Sam. 12.20; Bathsheba); *וַיָּבֹא דָוִד אֶל־בֵּיתוֹ* (2 Sam. 20.3; cf. 19.12; concubines). For David, going home and issues of sex and progeny appear related; business—or pleasure?—comes first!

⁸⁴¹ Studies of women in the Bible often take their point of departure from Samuel, in which at least seventeen women are named and many more are signified by other means. Studies on Michal have focused on her exploitation and victimisation, her role as a pawn who could be used in whatever way her father and husband found advantageous. Jobling 1998: 9 correctly says: '[David's] wives Michal and Abigail, like Hannah, take bold initiatives, but *their* initiatives are appropriated into a narrative strategy that is anything but pro-woman. Their energy is wholly channeled into the boosting of David's career, and no importance is ascribed to them beyond this'. The best treatments of women in Samuel are Jobling 1998: 127-194; Solvang 2003; and two unpublished doctoral theses: García Bachmann 1999; Todd 1990. The most helpful pieces on Michal from a literary perspective are Jobling 1998 and the contributions by Alter, Berlin, Clines, Exum, Miscall and Polzin in Clines and Eskenazi 1991. Good discussion is given throughout Berlin 1983; Exum 1992, 1993, 1996.

to this puzzling reading is to emend 'Michal' (מִיכָל) to 'Merab' (מֶרַב). However, this explanation is doubted by Fishkin, Gelandier and Noll⁸⁴², and 'Michal' is retained and defended by Barthélemy, Ben-Barak, Exum, Glück, Miscall and Walters.⁸⁴³ Barthélemy is correct to argue that the variation relates to editorial activity rather than scribal error. The editors of MT Samuel saw fit to revise biblical history by placing Michal in a story which favours neither her nor any other descendant of Saul—one final blow against the royal family, and against the queen herself.

The remainder of this chapter summarises three issues related to Michal in 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23.

- The reason for Michal's reproach of David.
- The role of 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23 in Samuel.
- The shape of the *Vorlage* of Chronicles.

6.1.2.1 The Reason for Michal's Reproach of David

Why did Michal react and reply as she did? It is very difficult to pinpoint the reason(s) for Michal's reproach of David, and equally hard to hold down a commentator to a single issue which he or she believes is the cause of Michal's behaviour. Clines aptly says:

Why does Michal reproach David? Here we are not short of textual evidence. There is the report of the narrator (6.16), Michal's own words to David (6.20), and David's reply (6.21-22)—the combination of which provides us with a stereoscopic view of the event. There is almost too much evidence of what passes between them, and yet we still feel that the text has not told us the whole truth, that we are meant to infer some deeper cause, some underlying agenda that Michal and David are addressing. ... No one motivation can account for the course of this episode. As Robert Alter puts it, her anger is 'overdetermined', containing within it all that

⁸⁴² Fishkin 1988: 56-65; Gelandier 1991: 70; Noll 1997: 43.

⁸⁴³ Barthélemy 1980: 18-19; 1982: 301-302; Ben-Barak 1991: 87; Exum 1991: 196; 1992: 91; 1993: 38, 45; Glück 1965; Jobling 1998: 184; Miscall 1991: 255-256; Walters 1993.

has never been said but more than has been hinted about the relation between her and David. Only 'multiple interpretation' can address the complexity of the tale.⁸⁴⁴

Most discussions (a) are noncommittal, in that they mention several explanations or are ambiguous in viewpoint, or (b) they make a general statement regarding David's behaviour, considering it undignified or unseemly or out-of-control, inappropriate for a king. This fact substantiates the ambiguity in the story itself. In other discussions one can perceive that the author *leans toward* a single specific explanation for Michal's reproach. These may be divided into two groups: those which focus on David, his activity or dress, and those which focus on Michal, her disposition or circumstances.⁸⁴⁵ The explanations related to David's activity or dress focus on the following topics:

- David's ecstatic religious activity is distasteful to Michal. She sees in David the out-of-control religious 'frenzy' of her father which also included nudity.
- David's religious activity seems too unfamiliar or innovative to Michal. David is instituting novel religious practices, or playing an unconventional priestly role, or performing a syncretistic religious ritual which merges Israelite (northern, Yahwistic) and Canaanite religion, including perhaps sacred prostitutes and cultic copulation. David's activity is a 'prelude to the sacred marriage'⁸⁴⁶ or a 'form of fertility rite'.⁸⁴⁷ Few, however, accept the Canaanite connection, and even fewer agree with Carlson and Porter. Nonetheless, many recognise a sexual dimension to the story.
- David's religious feat in transferring the ark provokes hostility in Michal because there was 'uneasiness with the ark itself among Saul's constituency'.⁸⁴⁸
- David's sexual behaviour is too abundant or vulgar for Michal's taste. David's behaviour is exhibitionistic or immoral. For Clines the real issue is sex⁸⁴⁹, whereas for Exum sex is a façade for the real issue of kingship.⁸⁵⁰ 'There is an odd mixture of royal conflict and sexual conflict here. The result of Michal's outburst ... is that she remains childless until the day of her death. ... [T]he punishment resembles the outburst in that it is for Michal both a sexual

⁸⁴⁴ Clines 1991b: 52, 60.

⁸⁴⁵ At least one scholar explicitly cites or embraces each explanation; however, references to particular scholars are mostly omitted since about one hundred are represented in the following list.

⁸⁴⁶ Porter 1954: 165-166.

⁸⁴⁷ Carlson 1964: 87, 94-95.

⁸⁴⁸ Halpern 2001: 333.

⁸⁴⁹ Clines 1991c: 137-138.

⁸⁵⁰ Exum 2000: 126; 1991: 183; 1992: 86-87.

tragedy and a family tragedy, since it means that no children will be born to one of the few surviving offspring of Saul's house'.⁸⁵¹

- David's behaviour like a commoner or plebeian displeases aristocratic Michal. He lacks royal dignity.
- David's attire is too scanty and thus revealing, showing David's lack of modesty. His use of an ephod and his dance movements are responsible for his undignified self-exposure.

The explanations related to Michal's disposition or circumstances focus on the following topics:

- Michal lacks religious sensibility, just like her father Saul. She is not a person of faith. She has lost sight of God. She is an idolater (1 Sam. 19.13, 16). She does not share the views of David who loves God. She is ignorant of the divine purpose, failing to recognise God's blessing of David. Michal has a more conservative religious outlook than David, or conversely, she is not more strict in her views but rather more arrogant.
- Michal is angry about the fate of her family, the suffering and loss of her father and siblings. David's dynastic ambitions, his political legitimisation, arouse bitterness in Michal.
- Michal is angry about her abandonment by David. Since then (1 Samuel 19) she has had a very difficult life. She never had the marriage she wanted with David. She is a dethroned romantic.
- Michal is angry about her broken marriage to Palti. True love was ruined by David.
- Michal is angry about David's acquisition of other wives. She is just one of many for David the womaniser. She is alone, a neglected co-wife. She is full of sexual jealousy.
- Michal is simply a bad wife in a rotten relationship. The marriage has broken down. No wonder she spoils the day!
- Who knows, perhaps Michal desires to lead the procession like her mentor Miriam had done in times gone by!⁸⁵²

It is impossible to know for certain where culpability lies. Does David behave inappropriately or does Michal misperceive his behaviour? Does David engage in 'bad' religious behaviour or is the issue really Michal's 'bad' religious sensibility? Is David's

⁸⁵¹ Hackett 1998: 98.

⁸⁵² F. E. Young 1962: 296 imagines this bizarre view.

dance illegitimate orgiastic dance rather than legitimate liturgical dance? The decisive factor is the credibility of Michal: Is there a basis in the story for adopting her point of view? NO.⁸⁵³ On the contrary, the entire story is strongly anti-Saulide. In the end, Michal's childlessness suggests that ultimately *she is wrong* about David, at least as HIS 'historians' perceive the issue.

6.1.2.2 The Role of 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23 in Samuel

Leonhard Rost's 1926 *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids* more than any other book has influenced modern discussion of 2 Samuel. Relevant to the present study is his conclusion that there are two separate traditions in 2 Samuel 6: the story of the ark (vv. 1-15, 17-20a) and the story of Michal (vv. 16, 20b-23). In his estimation vv. 1-15, 17-20a are part of the AN, which also includes most but not all of 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2, and this narrative is the *ἱερὸς λόγος* of the sanctuary of the ark in Jerusalem. Verses 16, 20b-23 are not part of this sanctuary legend, but rather, are the beginning of the 'Succession Narrative', and they function to answer negatively who will occupy David's throne: the heir to the throne will not be a Saulide.⁸⁵⁴ Rost says:

The only thing that 6.16 and 20ff. have in common with the ark narrative is that these verses describe an event which happened during and after the transfer of the ark to Jerusalem. They therefore have no place in a *ἱερὸς λόγος* of the ark.⁸⁵⁵

Rost's view on this material was accepted by Alt, Noth, and von Rad, among others, but has been criticised heavily since then:

Rost's assessment of the unity and historical worth of 2 Samuel 9–20 and 1 Kgs 1–2 as a unified political document stemming from the early days of Solomon's reign no longer reflects a consensus of scholarly opinion. Almost every aspect of Rost's analysis has required reassessment.⁸⁵⁶

⁸⁵³ See the quote on Michal's perspective by Berlin 1983: 72-73 in 6.1.1.3.4.

⁸⁵⁴ Rost 1982: 85-90.

⁸⁵⁵ Rost 1982: 87.

⁸⁵⁶ Forshey 1992: 1178. Rost's arguments for the separation of vv. 16, 20b-23 from the rest of the chapter and for their function as the beginning of the Succession Narrative are the grammar of *וְהָיָה* in v. 16

Some continue to believe that 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23 was affixed to the earlier AN as the start of the Succession Narrative/Court History (SN/CH)⁸⁵⁷, but the majority consider the Michal material a discrete and later tradition to the AN but not the beginning of the SN/CH.⁸⁵⁸ Other scholars suggest that the Michal material is earlier than the AN⁸⁵⁹; has been relocated from after 2 Sam. 5.1-3 to the AN⁸⁶⁰; is a 'variant account of the cultic drama led by David' in previous verses⁸⁶¹; originates from the composers of the 'History of David's Rise' (HDR)⁸⁶² or the redactors of the 'combined Saul and David story'⁸⁶³; or is indivisibly rooted in the AN.⁸⁶⁴

This writer's view is that the material in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 stands in its original place within the story of David's transfer of the ark, i.e., the story was originally composed with this verse, and the material in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is affixed, it is epilogical, and more precisely, it is exegesis on the earlier and briefer mention of Michal. The following support is offered for this view. First, 6.1-20a are a well-defined literary unit whereas 6.20b-23 fall outside the principal plot scheme.⁸⁶⁵ The action in 6.1-20a circles

and the theme of the material. Rost's belief that the theme of this material is 'succession' is heavily criticised. The character of David is more central to the material than Rost's hypothesis allows, and a number of subsidiary themes have been detected. See Keys 1996: 14-54, 123-155 and the discussion in 2.2. The dependence on subjective criteria for the demarcation of literary layers, namely, the discernment of different themes, interests or perspectives, both positive and negative, is unsafe.

⁸⁵⁷ Van Seters is one notable adherent (Van Seters 1983: 280; 2000: 81, 89-90).

⁸⁵⁸ Most scholars since Rost set the limits of the SN/CH at 2 Samuel 9–20 and 1 Kings 1–2. Römer and de Pury 2000: 126 say no chapter gives a satisfactory introduction to this narrative and wonder whether the original beginning has been lost or altered at the time of the insertion of the collection into the DH.

⁸⁵⁹ Hempel 1964: 148; Vermeulen 2000: 233-236.

⁸⁶⁰ Gunn 1978: 66-67, 73-76.

⁸⁶¹ Seow 1989: 136.

⁸⁶² Mettinger 1976: 45; Weiser 1966: 347-348.

⁸⁶³ Conroy 1983: 104.

⁸⁶⁴ A. A. Anderson 1989: 99; Campbell 1975: 139, 142, 163, 168; Caquot and de Robert 1994: 418; Carlson 1964: 61-62, 92-96; Gordon 1986: 235; Keys 1996: 72-73; Sacon 1982: 27, 47-48; Schulte 1972: 138.

⁸⁶⁵ Campbell 1975: 126-127, 139; Fokkelman 1990: 176-184; Gunn 1978: 73-74; Murray 1998: 145-146; cf. 145-156; Youngblood 1992: 872-873. Also see Gelernder 1991: 46-53, who believes, however, that 'it is ... difficult to point to either of the two episodes as an appendage of secondary importance'.

from Jerusalem to Jerusalem. Amit shows (and illustrates for Samuel) that a 'concentric ending' is 'typical of many biblical narratives'.⁸⁶⁶ See 5.0. Second, 6.16 cannot be separated from 6.1-20a on any basis whatsoever. Yet, as commentators routinely point out, v. 16 'prepares' for vv. 20b-23. However, in this writer's view this description is anachronistic since v. 16 suggested or motivated the addition of vv. 20b-23. Third, 6.20b-23 is preparatory in a negative way to 7.8-9, 11b-16: the heir to the throne will not be a Saulide; rather, he will be a descendant of David. Compare נגיד in 6.21 and 7.8; ילד in 6.23 with זרע in 7.12 and בן in 7.14; and בית in the sense of 'family, dynasty' in 6.(12?), 20-21 and 7.11, 16. In contrast, the arrival and placement of the ark in Jerusalem in 6.1-20a has its counterpart in 7.1-3, 5-7, 13. Compare אהל in 6.17 with יריעה in 7.2 and אהל in 7.6, and בית in the sense of 'dwelling' in 6.3-4, 10-11 (12?) and 7.5-7, 13.⁸⁶⁷ Whereas 6.1-20a led nicely into 2 Samuel 7 with respect to the 'house as [Yahweh's] dwelling' theme, the brief mention of 'Michal, the daughter of Saul' in 6.16 provided the opportunity to develop the theme of 'house as dynasty' in 6.20b-23 in preparation for the promise of a descendant of David in 2 Samuel 7.⁸⁶⁸ Fourth, Conroy, Mettinger, and Weiser connect the Michal material in 2 Samuel 6 with the stories of Saul and David in 1 Samuel. The questions posed by Dietrich and Naumann are appropriate:

... the fact that David makes an end of the Philistines (2 Sam 5:17-25) might be taken as a sensible conclusion to the many reports of confrontations with the Philistines in the Rise story. On the other hand, this passage now appears to be a bridge to the one in 2 Samuel 6 about the bringing in of the Ark, which earlier had actually fallen into Philistine hands. Should this also belong to the Rise of David—even, from a pious point of view, constituting its very climax? Corresponding to this and contradicting it at the same time is the fact that 2 Samuel 6 ends with a fight between David and Michal. Was it not the Rise story that previously again

⁸⁶⁶ Amit 2001: 17-21, 35-36.

⁸⁶⁷ The framework of Yahweh's speech is in 2 Sam. 7.4, 17.

⁸⁶⁸ On the relationship between 2 Samuel 6 and 7 see Ackroyd 1977: 71-72; Auld 2000a: 20; Eslinger 1994: 42; Flanagan 1988: 199-203, 235; Robinson 1993: 184; Seow 1989: 136, 139. Carlson 1964 and Murray 1998 are the best attempts to read 2 Samuel 6 and 7 together. Contrary to Van Seters 1983: 281, 2 Sam. 6.16, 20-23 does not 'seriously interrupt[s] the continuity of subject matter' and it is not 'incongruous with the tone of the chapter that follows'.

and again illuminated the developed relationship between these two (1 Sam 18.20ff.; 19.11ff.; 25.44; 2 Sam 3.12ff.)?⁸⁶⁹

Again, it may be suggested that the expansion (vv. 20b-23) of the brief reference (v. 16) to Michal has apologetic intent related to the preceding stories of Saul and David. Fifth, throughout the analysis of 2 Sam. 6.1-20a // 1 Chron. 13.5-14; 15.25-16.3, 43, emphasis is placed on distinctive features of MT Samuel which are textually secondary yet literarily linked to the non-synoptic stories in 1 Samuel by means of the theme 'Davidic displacement of the Saulide dynasty'. This is a feature of the story of David's ark transfer in vv. 1-20a which has been inadequately documented, and which closely ties the expansion in vv. 20b-23 to the stories in 1 Samuel. In this writer's view, then, 6.20b-23 is an expansionary supplement of the brief reference to Michal in v. 16 and a parallel supplement related to the stories of Saul and David in 1 Samuel. The exploration of Michal was simultaneously a journey into her father's break-up before Yahweh and David. This is the direction in which the cumulative textual and literary evidence points.

Michal appears in the Bible in four notations (1 Sam. 14.49-51; 25.43-44; 2 Sam. 21.7-9; 1 Chron. 15.29) and four episodes (1 Sam. 18.12-29; 19.8-18; 2 Sam. 3.12-16; 6.12-23).⁸⁷⁰ Clines says that even though it may be incorrect to speak of a Michal story since the story is no more than a string of somewhat disjointed episodes scattered through the David story, the final scene functions very successfully as a climax to her story.⁸⁷¹ *Michal's final scene functions to theologically legitimate David's kingship while rejecting Saulide claims to power over Israel.* The royal lineage of Saul has come to an end, but the royal lineage of David is just beginning.⁸⁷² The Michal story is not about David's domestic qualities and it does not warn against cavalier opposition to David's religious

⁸⁶⁹ Dietrich and Naumann 2000: 295.

⁸⁷⁰ The terminology is from Clines 1991b: 26.

⁸⁷¹ Clines 1991b: 52.

⁸⁷² Yahweh declares the Davidic/non-Saulide dynasty in 2 Samuel 7.

practices. Furthermore, David's blessing on his house (v. 20a) is not undone by Michal's reproach; rather, the blessing on David to the exclusion of Saul is realised through Michal's childlessness (v. 23) and Yahweh's promise (2 Samuel 7).⁸⁷³ Finally, the story does not obstruct a supposed attempt on the part of David to unify the two houses for political gain. The *biblical* David never hoped for a son from the marriage to Michal, who would eventually become his successor.⁸⁷⁴ First, Yahweh declares that no descendant of Saul would sit upon Israel's throne (1 Sam. 13.13-14). Second, 2 Sam. 3.12-16 is regularly understood as a move on the part of David to secure a claim to the throne by repositioning himself back into the house of Saul. However, David's request for the return of Michal can be read in very different ways. Had he simply remembered the loyal partner who saved him when his life was at risk? Did he wish to enlist additional Saulide support through her? Was he concerned that another (Abner?) might take her and through marriage and paternity become a rival to David? Actually, the reason for David's request is given in the story: David wished to test Abner's genuineness.⁸⁷⁵ The political intentions of the historical David with respect to Michal are unknowable. To conclude, and for further consideration, Christensen locates the centre-point of the book of Samuel, the transition from judges to David's empire, precisely in Michal's alienation in 2 Sam. 6.20-23.⁸⁷⁶ With respect to both the theme and composition of Samuel he may have a point.

⁸⁷³ 'In Samuel the development of the theme of blessing David's house is interrupted—but also focussed—by the plus in 2 Sam 6,20b-23 reporting the altercation between David and Michal' (Auld 2000a: 20). The blessing is not 'aborted' as some declare.

⁸⁷⁴ Many hold this view, citing Bright 1981: 208; Noth 1958: 199.

⁸⁷⁵ McCarter 1984: 114.

⁸⁷⁶ Christensen 2002: 49-50; cf. 45-68; cf. Flanagan 1988: 238.

6.1.2.3 The Shape of the *Vorlage* of Chronicles

The lengthy statement by Japhet represents scholarly opinion and encapsulates most of the issues related to this issue.⁸⁷⁷ Scholars agree on two points. First, 2 Sam. 6.16 was preserved with slight alterations and reinterpreted to demonstrate the contrast between pious David and the impious lineage he had replaced. Michal is an example of the way of unfaithfulness. Yahweh did right in deposing the house of Saul and installing David. *Michal's cameo in 1 Chron. 15.29 is a foil to highlight David's success and concern for the cultus against the backdrop of Saul's failure and disinterest in the things of God.* The view of Curtis and Madsen, that v. 29 '... is a mark of the unskillful art of the Chronicler'⁸⁷⁸, is unacceptable. Second, 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 was omitted for one of the following reasons:

- The Chronicler wanted to continue the dedication festivities uninterrupted.
- The Chronicler wanted to end his account of David's transfer of the ark on a positive note.
- The Chronicler would not allow to stand a harsh judgment on the king from members of the contemptible house of Saul.
- The Chronicler considered this material irrelevant to his message since the dishonour of Saul's house required no further proof (1 Chron. 10.13-14; 13.3; 15.29). It was unnecessary to preserve 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 since the retention of 2 Sam. 6.16 was sufficient for the Chronicler's message.
- The Chronicler was uninterested in the private affairs of David, his *res domestica*. For this reason the material about Michal, Bathsheba (2 Samuel 11-12) and Absalom (2 Samuel 13-20) is set aside.
- The Chronicler was concerned about the image of David, the pious and ideal king. This material is damaging to his image and derogatory to the splendour of the early monarchy. For this reason the material about Michal, Bathsheba and Absalom is not retained. In particular, the Chronicler shared Michal's view that David's attire and activity were inappropriate, and consequently vv. 20b-23 were deleted and the vocabulary of 2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27 and 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 was adjusted.

⁸⁷⁷ Japhet 1993: 307-308.

⁸⁷⁸ Curtis and Madsen 1910: 219.

Several issues merit comment. First, Chronicles' *Vorlage* should be considered in light of the literary integrity and aims of 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23. See 6.1.2.2. Second, Japhet describes the portrayals of Saul and David in the book of Chronicles⁸⁷⁹ and it must be remembered that the book does not attempt systematically to present David as an 'ideal' character.⁸⁸⁰ Hamilton says:

... for the most part the portions that Chronicles deletes deal with incidents in David's life that are disturbing, questionable, immoral, or inimical toward David. This is not to say that Chronicles whitewashes David and makes a sinner into a saint. Chronicles does include David's second great sin, the taking of the census, and 1 Chron. 22:8 uses much stronger language ("you have shed much blood"), as does 28:3 ("you have shed blood"), than 1 Kings 5:3 does to explain why David cannot build the temple.⁸⁸¹

Third, the assertion is unverified that 1 Chron. 15.29 requires prior knowledge of Michal in order to make sense of the Chronicler's statement⁸⁸², and the same can be said for claims on 2 Sam. 6.16.⁸⁸³ The Chronicler has already related Saul's lineage (8.33; 9.39), Saul's and his sons' deaths (10.1-12 // 1 Sam. 31.1-13), David's control of Saul's army (11.2 // 2 Sam. 5.2), David's battles with Saul and the desertion of some of Saul's warriors to David (12.1-2, 19, 23, 29), and he has pointedly articulated Saul's cultic unfaithfulness (10.13-14; 13.3), and he has reported the coronation of David as king over Israel (11.1-3 // 2 Sam. 5.1-3) This information efficiently prepares the reader for comprehending the role of 'Michal, the daughter of Saul' as a foil in 1 Chron. 15.29. Furthermore, *exactly what* in 1 Sam. 14.49; 18.20-28; 19.11-17; 25.44; and 2 Sam. 3.13-14, is required for understanding 2 Sam. 6.16? What difference does it make here whether or not she is even the wife of David? The contrast is between David and Saul, and she is unmistakably one of Saul's. An evolution in the character of Michal is perceptible in the material prior to the

⁸⁷⁹ Japhet 1997: 405-411, 467-478.

⁸⁸⁰ Japhet 1993: 48; 1997: 473-478; Williamson 1982: 118.

⁸⁸¹ Hamilton 2001: 370.

⁸⁸² As stated by, e.g., McKenzie 1999: 82; Steussy 1999: 110-111.

⁸⁸³ As stated by, e.g., Miller and Roberts 1977: 25; van der Toorn and Houtman 1994: 224.

present context, but here the implicature of 'the daughter of Saul' is clear enough. Assuming 'Merab, the daughter of Saul' is the original reading in 2 Sam. 21.8, would 1 Sam. 14.49 and 18.17-19 be necessary for understanding her role there? No. Auld must be taken seriously:

There are many teasingly brief fragments of information in the biblical narratives. This lone verse about Michal at a window despising David makes perfectly adequate sense in (BTH or) Chronicles. Mention of a daughter of Saul after the report of his death at Gilboa, 'he and his three sons and all his house together' (1 Chron. 10.6), suggests either that the report was proleptic or exaggerated, or that as a daughter she was not reckoned in his house – or that she belonged already in another man's house. The stories in Samuel of David, Saul and Michal may quite as well have been inspired by an earlier reader of BTH glimpsing Michal through that same window and turning story-teller himself.⁸⁸⁴

The burden of proof rests on scholars who assert that the statement in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 requires prior knowledge of Michal. They must also show that this prior knowledge must be literary in form and could not have been transmitted orally.

It is shown in this and previous chapters that the editors of both 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 adjusted many details in the story. Furthermore, in many cases the evidence does not support the view that words and constructions in Chronicles are the Chronicler's adjustments vis-à-vis Samuel. On one hand, if the Chronicler was so bothered by David's behaviour why did he retain 2 Sam. 6.16 at all?⁸⁸⁵ On the other hand, if the Chronicler 'lightened' the terminology used for David's attire and activity in 2 Sam. 6.14, 16 why could he not reproduce 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 with similar or even more substantial adjustments? There are four options for understanding the origin of 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-23 and its relationship to the book of Chronicles:

⁸⁸⁴ Auld 1999b: 94. Fishkin 1988: 15-57 shows that Michal as a character and person did not remain static in *post-biblical literature*.

⁸⁸⁵ 'This brief reference to the well-known history, fully reported in 2 Sam. vi. 16, 20-23, of the dispute between David and Michal, shows sufficiently that the Chronist did not wish to be silent concerning this matter from dogmatic or aesthetic considerations. Moreover, ver. 29-xvi. 3 agrees in all essentials with 2 Sam. vi. 16-19a' (Zöckler 1876: 116).

- The material in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 is original. It is taken from Samuel by the composers of Chronicles or vice versa, or it is adopted by the composers of both Samuel and Chronicles from a common source. The composers of Samuel add the material in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23.
- The material in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is original. The composers of Chronicles omit this material. The composers of either Samuel or Chronicles add the material in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 and it is subsequently transferred into the other version.
- All of 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 and 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is original. The composers of Chronicles omit the material in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23.
- None of 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 and 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is original. The material is added to each version according to the possibilities described above.

A decision regarding what material is original in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 and 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 should be taken in light of (1) the periods of composition of these books; however, these are not known with sufficient precision; (2) the editorial history of the Michal episode as a part of the story of David's transfer of the ark; and (3) broader patterns of editorial adjustments within and beyond 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16, which may enable one to discern the direction of movement in the passage at hand.

6.2 Summary of Chapter Six

The Michal material in 2 Sam. 6.16 // 1 Chron. 15.29 and 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 clearly backs the Davidic claim to the throne while rejecting the Saulides. David assertively replies to Michal with twice as many words as she uses to rebuke him. His speech redefines Michal's view of honour and dishonour by affirming the maxim 'whoever humbles himself will be exalted'. Murray says: 'With a cruelly sardonic twist to her own words the esteem of haughty, aristocratic Michal is set beneath that of the lowly serving-girls with whom she thought to humiliate David'.⁸⁸⁶

⁸⁸⁶ Murray 1998: 144.

At the outset it should not go unnoticed that there are very difficult text-critical problems in 2 Sam. 6.16, 20b-22, but not in v. 23 which, however, on the surface is exceedingly cryptic. As in previous chapters the significant textual and literary issues addressed in this chapter may be summarised according to 'apology of Davidic kingship', 'apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character', and 'influence of cultic practice'. The third theme, influence of cultic practice, is relatively insignificant in this material, but only in this material in the story of David's transfer of the ark. Similarly, the theme 'apology of Davidic kingship' is relatively insignificant in 2 Sam. 6.6-10 // 1 Chron. 13.9-13.

First, the theme apology of Davidic kingship. Michal's role as representative of the Saulides is underscored by the repetition of the epithet **בת שאול** in vv. 16, 20b and 23, which also stands opposite **עיר דוד** in v. 16. See 6.1.1.1.1, 6.1.1.1.2. The relationship of the long relative clause in v. 21 to the story's pro-David/anti-Saul thrust is obvious. In particular, the terms **בחר**, **צוה** and **נגיד** relate the present passage to the history of David and Saul in 1 Samuel. See 6.1.1.3.3. Verse 23 emphatically asserts by Michal's childlessness the end of Saulide claims to the throne. She, unlike David's other wives, died without children. See 6.1.1.4.1. However, subsequent editors revised biblical history by introducing Michal into a story which favours neither her nor any other descendant of Saul—one final blow against the royal family, and against the queen herself (cf. MT 2 Sam. 21.8). See 6.1.2. Additional expressions in 2 Sam. 6.20b-22 which reinforce David's kingship are **לקראת** (6.1.1.2.1), **אמהות עבדיו** (6.1.1.2.3) and **הרקים** (6.1.1.2.3) in 20b; **ברוך** (reinstated?; 6.1.1.3.2) and **על-עם יהוה** (6.1.1.3.3) in v. 21; and **שפל** (6.1.1.3.6), **האמהות** (6.1.1.3.7) and **עמם** (6.1.1.3.7) in v. 22.

Second, the theme apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character. First and foremost, David acts **לפני יהוה** (vv. 16, 21 [twice]). See 6.1.1.1.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.4. On one hand, by ridiculing Michal's character, David simultaneously upholds his own

character and discredits Saulide rule over Israel. Michal, unlike Hannah, Abigail and the wise women of Tekoa and Abel Beth-maacah, is not an אמה (v. 20b, 22). See 6.1.1.2.3. Similarly, הרקים in v. 20b says more about Michal's lack of sensibility than about David. See 6.1.1.2.3. On the other hand, David's character is safeguarded by imprecision regarding his precise activity (about which *too much* is said!), by uncertainty concerning the reason for Michal's anger, and by the hazy (yet *precisely* stated!) declaration of Michal's childlessness in v. 23. In particular, the absence of רקד in vv. 16, 20b and 21 (6.1.1.1.3, 6.1.1.2.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.4), and the appearance of קלל (6.1.1.3.5) and בעני (6.1.1.3.6) in v. 22, signify editorial interest in upholding the king's piety. MT Samuel's transmitters augmented the negative portrayal of Saul's daughter Michal while portraying David as the valid monarch, yet they also struggled with several aspects of David's personal behaviour. It may be that Michal's attitude toward David inadvertently rubbed off on them! Tension between the Davidic and Saulide dynasties is played out in the story and in the redaction of the text of the story. Ancient editors were pawns in the hands of the text and story as much as the text and story were pawns in the hands of those editors.

CONCLUSION

Chapters one and two are preparatory to the analysis of biblical texts in chapters three through six. Chapter one surveys areas of research related to Samuel and Chronicles. First, the writer summarises research and perspectives on these books and their stories of David's transfer of the ark. The review highlights competing approaches to Samuel which centre on either sources or composition and on either a diachronic or synchronic methodology. The literary history of Samuel is inadequate in conventional perspective, and must be freshly unfolded, and consequently the relationship of Samuel and Chronicles must also be re-evaluated. Second, the writer reviews the textual evidence for both books, focusing on the received versions, the Greek translations, and in the case of Samuel, on the Dead Sea Scrolls. The witnesses to Chronicles are relatively uniform, and it is suggested that the pluriformity among witnesses to Samuel, and the character of the MT of this book, are related to Samuel's editorial history. In particular, revisers reshaped the story of David's transfer of the ark in Chronicles *and* Samuel.

Chapter two surveys issues related to synchronic and diachronic approaches to Samuel and Chronicles. The writer suggests that the impasse between these competing approaches may be resolved by the textual-exegetical approach, that is, by using text-critical controls on redactional arguments. The versional evidence substantiates the validity of the diachronic approach—*there are* earlier and later forms of biblical texts and editions of biblical stories—and scholars can use this evidence to discern literary origins and developments—developments in the versions whose special features, and the reasons for them, may be perceived and appreciated through holistic or final-form readings. Related to this, the writer points out that textual variation and grammatical and stylistic incongruities and lexical discrepancies frequently signal editorial developments in

biblical compositions. Three helpful models for understanding this developmental process are considered: McKane's rolling corpus, Tov's and Ulrich's literary layers, and Fishbane's inner-biblical exegesis. Finally, it is stated that the principal text-critical aim in this thesis is the detection of earlier and later forms of biblical texts or stories, or to state it differently, the discovery of earlier and later stages in their editorial histories.

Chapters three through six closely examine 2 Samuel 6 and the synoptic portions of 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. The writer argues that many details in MT Samuel's story of the ark are secondary, are connected to the language of stories in 1 Samuel, and aim to advance David's kingship and character. In total, the writer discerns three *interconnected* themes that influenced the revision of MT 2 Samuel 6: an apology of Davidic kingship, an apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character, and cultic practice. The manner in which these themes map onto a particular section of MT 2 Samuel 6 (vv. 1-5; 6-10; 11-15, 17-20a; 16, 20b-23) is summarised at the end of each chapter (3.2, 4.2, 5.2, 6.2). Twenty-nine features special to MT 2 Samuel 6 are associated with one theme, six with two themes⁸⁸⁷, and two with three themes.⁸⁸⁸ The assignment of a variant reading to one theme rather than another is arbitrary to a degree. Politics and religion *are* related matters. The story has a *royal-sacral* thrust. An MT Samuel variant reading may be pro-David and anti-Saul with regard to kingship while simultaneously extolling David's cultic behaviour, i.e. his character, vis-à-vis Saul's. Similarly, the denigration of Uzzah's cultic activity, i.e., an anti-Uzzah stance, may at the same time advance a pro-David and pro-Yahweh perspective by liberating the latter two from any perceivable misconduct. In addition, an implicit comparison between David and Yahweh may give approval to the king's character and behaviour. The following tables sum up these connected themes in MT 2 Samuel 6 as a whole. The reader should consult the appropriate section in the thesis for

⁸⁸⁷ כל-המון ישראל; שלמים; ויזבח; בית עבד אדם; על-השל; בני אבינרב.

⁸⁸⁸ אפוד בד; לפני יהוה.

the writer's explanation of each variant reading. The non-synoptic material in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 is summarised separately from the synoptic portions of the stories.

The following variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are secondary to the versions of this book or Chronicles and are related to the theme apology of Davidic kingship. *David is appropriately and rightfully king rather than Saul.*

v. 1	עוד (3.1.1.2) כל־בחור בישראל (3.1.3.1) שלשים אלף (3.1.3.2) אסף (3.1.1.2; perhaps)
v. 2	כל־העם אשר אתו (3.1.3.3)
vv. 3-4	בגבעה (3.1.2.3)
v. 5	כל־בית ישראל (3.1.3.4)
vv. 5, 14, 16, 17	לפני יהוה (3.1.4.1, 5.1.3.5, 5.1.3.6, 6.1.1.1.3; cf. 6.1.1.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.4, appendix 2)
v. 11	כל־ביתו (5.1.1.2; perhaps; cf. v 12, בית עבד אדם, [5.1.1.3])
v. 12	המלך דוד (5.1.1.3) עיר דוד (5.1.2.1)
v. 14	אפוד בד (5.1.3.6, 5.1.3.7; ועל־דוד אפוד בד is secondary in Chronicles)
v. 15	כל־בית ישראל (5.1.2.2; cf. v. 5, 3.1.3.4)
v. 16	והיה (6.1.1.1.1)
v. 17	שלמים (5.1.3.5; placement)
v. 19a	כל־המון ישראל (5.1.3.8)

The following variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are related to the theme apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character. *David is a superior person, standing up even to Yahweh, and Uzzah definitely misbehaves rather than the king or the deity.*

vv. 3-4	וישאהו (3.1.2.3) בני אבינודב (3.1.5.1, 3.1.5.2; clear identity, ambiguous location)
vv. 5, 14, 16, 17	לפני יהוה (3.1.4.1, 5.1.3.5, 5.1.3.6, 6.1.1.1.3; cf. 6.1.1.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.4, appendix 2)
v. 6	ויאחז (4.1.1.2) minus את־ידו (4.1.1.2; perhaps)
v. 7	האלהים (4.1.2.2) על־השל (4.1.2.2) עם ארון האלהים (4.1.2.3; cf. 3.1.5.1, 3.1.5.2)
v. 11	בית עבד אדם (5.1.1.1; perhaps; <i>in</i> the בית; בביתו is secondary in Chronicles)
v. 12	ויגד ... האלהים (5.1.1.3)
v. 13	כי צעדו ... צעדים (5.1.3.3; cf. 4.1.3.2) minus מחלות (5.1.3.3; cf. 6.1.1.3.4; perhaps) ויזבח (5.1.3.4; singular)
v. 14	בכל־עז (4.1.3.2, 5.1.3.6) is secondary in Chronicles ועל־דוד אפוד דב (5.1.3.6, 5.1.3.7; אפוד בד)
vv. 16	minus רקד (6.1.1.1.3; cf. 6.1.1.2.3, 6.1.1.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.4; perhaps)
v. 17	ויעל (5.1.3.5; singular) שלמים (5.1.3.5; placement)
v. 19a	כל־המון ישראל (5.1.3.8)

The following variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are related to the theme cultic practice. They reinforce the story's royal-sacral thrust (i.e., David as king-priest), add a cultic touch, or link to cultic material elsewhere.

v. 2	is secondary in Chronicles יהוה יושב הכרובים (3.1.6.2; שם יהוה צבאות ישב הכרובים עליו)
vv. 3-4	מבית אבינודב (3.1.2.3, 3.1.5.2; also secondary in Chronicles) בני אבינודב (3.1.5.1, 3.1.5.2; clear identity)
v. 5	בכל עצי ברושים (3.1.4.2) צלצלים (3.1.4.3, appendix 2; perhaps)
vv. 5, 14, 16, 17	לפני יהוה (3.1.4.1, 5.1.3.5, 5.1.3.6, 6.1.1.1.3; cf. 6.1.1.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.4, appendix 2)
v. 7	על־השל (4.1.2.2)
v. 11	בית עבד אדם (5.1.1.1; perhaps; <i>in</i> his בית; בביתו is secondary in Chronicles)
v. 13	ויזבח (5.1.3.4; singular)
v. 14	is secondary in Chronicles ועל־דוד אפוד דב (5.1.3.6, 5.1.3.7; perhaps; אפוד בד)
v. 17	במקומו (5.1.2.3)
v. 18	בשם יהוה צבאות (5.1.3.9)

The variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel in the preceding tables augment the three themes beyond their presence in the shared material in Samuel and Chronicles. For example, the theme of cultic practice is evident already in references to 'before Yahweh/God' (2 Sam. 6.5, 17 // 1 Chron. 13.8; 16.1; cf. 13.10), *David's* sacrifice (*shared* in 2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2), David's blessing (2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2) and perhaps עגלה חדשה (2 Sam. 6.3 [cf. v. 4] // 1 Chron. 13.7).

Some variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are secondary and related to stylistic, lexical or rhetorical preferences.

v. 6	גרן נכון (4.1.1.1)
v. 7	אף (4.1.2.1; also secondary in Chronicles)
v. 10	אבה ... להסיר (4.1.3.5; probably secondary to הסיר in 1 Chron. 13.13)
v. 13	ששה (5.1.3.3)
v. 18	העולה (5.1.3.5; also secondary in 1 Chron. 16.2)
v. 19a	כל־העם (5.1.3.8; cf. 3.1.3.3, appendix 1; probably secondary to the minus in 1 Chron. 16.3)
v. 19a	למאיש (5.1.3.8, appendix 3; probably secondary to מאיש in 1 Chron. 16.3)
v. 19a	Triple אחד (5.1.38)

The following variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are less certain. In the writer's opinion, Samuel is secondary in the first and second and Chronicles in the third and fourth.

v. 2	ויקם וילך (3.1.1.3; primary or secondary to ויעל in 1 Chron. 13.6?)
v. 8	על אשר (4.1.3.1, appendix 3; primary or secondary to כי in 1 Chron. 13.11?)
v. 9	יבוא (4.1.3.4; primary or secondary to אביא in 1 Chron. 13.12?)
v. 19b	וילכו (5.1.2.4; primary or secondary to וילכו in 1 Chron. 16.43?)

Finally, some variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel are probably antecedent to readings in Chronicles.

v. 9	איך (4.1.3.4, appendix 3; probably primary to חך in 1 Chron. 13.12)
v. 10	אל־בית without preposition (4.1.3.6; cf. 5.1.1.1; probably primary to בית in 1 Chron. 13.13)
v. 19a	חלת (5.1.3.8, appendix; probably primary to ככר in 1 Chron. 16.3)
v. 20a	וישב (5.1.2.4; probably primary to ויסב in 1 Chron. 16.43)

In the preceding tables the writer refers to variant readings in synoptic MT Samuel that are inserted *secondarily* into MT Chronicles. The reader should consult the appropriate section in the thesis for the writer's argumentation in each case. These interpolations are:

2 Sam. 6.2 // 1 Chron. 13.6	(3.1.6.2) יהוה יושב הכרובים // שם יהוה צבאות ישב הכרובים עליו
2 Sam. 6.3 // 1 Chron. 13.7	(3.1.2.3, 3.1.5.2) מבית אבינדב
2 Sam. 6.7 // 1 Chron. 13.10	אף (4.1.2.1)
2 Sam. 6.11 // 1 Chron. 13.14	(5.1.1.1) בביתו // (in the בית) בית עבד אדם
2 Sam. 6.14 // 1 Chron. 15.27	(5.1.3.6, 5.1.3.7) ועל־דויד אפוד דב // [ודוד חגור] אפוד בד
2 Sam. 6.18 // 1 Chron. 16.2	העולה (singular; 5.1.3.5)

First, אף may have been inserted independently in both Samuel and Chronicles on the basis of style. Second, it is well known that inter-textual dialogue is a widespread feature of biblical literature, and this is all the more understandable for synoptic material. Third, it is not surprising that biblical editors occasionally adjusted Chronicles on the basis of Samuel since Samuel 'ranked higher in canonical esteem' than Chronicles.⁸⁸⁹ See 1.3.3 and 2.3.2.1.

Turning to non-synoptic 2 Sam. 6.20b-23, this plus in and of itself, and very many *primary* features within it, uphold Davidic kingship and guard Davidic and Yahwistic character. See the chapter summary in 6.2. The following features of *MT* Samuel, although they function similarly, are *secondary to the 'original' plus*.

⁸⁸⁹ Würthwein 1979: 18.

v. 20b	וְהַבְרָכָה minus (6.1.1.2.2; very uncertain)
v. 20b	הַרְקִים, secondary to הִרְקִים (6.1.1.2.3; see the next entry)
vv. 20b, 21	רָקַד minus in vv. 16, 20b, 21 (twice) (6.1.1.1.3, 6.1.1.2.3, 6.1.1.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.4) (and also the minus of מַחְלוֹת in v. 13 [5.1.3.3; cf. 6.1.1.3.4])
v. 21	<p>The bracketed words are secondary to the highlighted original text:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל־מִיכָל לִפְנֵי יְהוָה [אֲשֶׁר בַּחֲרִיבִי מֵאֲבִיךָ וּמִכָּל־בֵּיתוֹ] [לְצוֹת אֶת־נָגִיד עַל־עַם יְהוָה עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל] [וְ] [שִׁחֲקֶתִי] [לִפְנֵי יְהוָה]</p> <p>See the following entries on the underlined words. Hebrew Samuel underwent pre-LXX expansion and post-LXX corruption (6.1.1.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.3, 6.1.1.3.4; also 3.1.4.1, 5.1.3.5, 5.1.3.6, 6.1.1.1.3 and appendix 2 on לִפְנֵי יְהוָה in vv. 5, 14, 16, 17).</p>
v. 21	לְצוֹת, secondary to לְשׁוֹם (6.1.1.3.3)
v. 21	עַל־עַם יְהוָה, secondary to עַל־עַמּוֹ (6.1.1.3.3)
v. 22	וּנְקַלְחִי, secondary to וּנְגַלִּיתִי (6.1.1.3.5)
v. 22	בְּעִינִי, secondary to בְּעִינָיו (6.1.1.3.6)
v. 22	עִמָּם plus (6.1.1.3.7)
v. 22	אֶכְבֹּד, secondary to אֶכְבֹּדָה (6.1.1.3.7; less certain)

The writer argues that vv. 20b-23 are an epilogue, that the lengthy relative clause within it is an addition (v. 21), and that several words (לְצוֹת, יְהוָה [עַל־עַם]) in the plus (v. 21) within the epilogue (vv. 20b-23) are secondary. This series of supplements and alterations underscores the long editorial history of the passage in (MT) Samuel.

The writer discusses the significance of 'doublets' (defined broadly) in chapters one and two.⁸⁹⁰ The instances that have been detected in 2 Samuel 6 // 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 are summarised in the following table.

⁸⁹⁰ See 1.3.2, 2.2, 2.3.2.1, 2.3.2.4, 2.3.2.5.

LXX 2 Sam. 6.2	ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων Ἰουδα / ἐν [LXX ^L τῇ] ἀναβάσει [LXX ^L + τοῦ βουνοῦ]; see 3.1.2.2
MT 2 Sam. 6.2	שם שם; repetition for reinterpretation; see 3.1.6.2
MT+ 2 Sam. 6.3, 4, 7	The position of the attendants; see 3.1.5.2, 4.1.2.3
LXX 2 Sam. 6.5	ἐν ὀργάνοις ἡρμουςμένοις / [LXX ^A καὶ] ἐν ἰσχύι καὶ ἐν ψδαῖς; see 3.1.4.2
LXX 2 Sam. 6.6	κατασχεῖν αὐτήν / καὶ ἐκράτησεν/ἐκραταίωσεν αὐτήν / τοῦ κατασχεῖν/σχιζεῖν αὐτήν; see 4.1.1.2
OL 2 Sam. 6.12, 13	<i>et erant cum David septem chori et victima vituli / cumque transcendissent qui portabant arcam Domini sex passus immolabat bovem et arietem</i> ; see 5.1.3.3
Jacob 2 Sam. 6.14	אנפס ארם ארם ארם ארם / ארם ארם ארם ארם / אנפס ארם ארם ארם ארם; see 5.1.3.6
MT+ 2 Sam. 6.20b	נגלות / כהגלות; see 6.1.1.2.3
Jacob 2 Sam. 6.20b	אנפס ארם ארם / אנפס ארם ארם; see 6.1.1.2.3
MT 2 Sam. 6.21	לפני יהוה / לפני יהוה; Wiederaufnahme; see 6.1.1.3, 6.1.1.3.2, 6.1.1.3.3
MT+ 1 Chron. 13.14	עם־בית עבד אדם / בביתו; see 5.1.1.1
MT+ 1 Chron. 15.27	ועל־דוד אפוד בד / ודוד מכרבל במעיל בוך; see 5.1.3.6, 5.1.3.7
MT+ 1 Chron. 13, 15–16	The identity of Obed-edom (Gittite and Levite); see 4.1.3.6

Samuel shows significantly more instances of this phenomenon than Chronicles, and it is interesting that two of three in the latter are interpolations from Samuel.

There are many links between the stories about David and Saul (1 Samuel 16–31) and David and Absalom (2 Samuel 13–20) (see 2.1 and appendix 5) and there are also many links between the ark stories in 1 Sam. 4.1b–7.2 and 2 Samuel 6 (see 1.2.2 and appendix 4). In addition, throughout this thesis the writer has pointed out many links between 2 Samuel 6 and other passages in Samuel. *Many of these links are secondary* (see the tables above). The linked passages occur throughout 1 Samuel, but they cluster in **1 Samuel 10–15** (from Saul's anointing to David's in chapter 16). **Chapter 13** is noteworthy. The reader should also observe the significant links with **1 Samuel 2** (Hannah and Samuel) and **1 Samuel 25** (Abigail), and also with **1 Samuel 17** (Goliath). *From the perspective of 1 Samuel, the number of links may seem unimpressive; but from the perspective of 2 Samuel 6 (a single chapter!) the large number of links is striking.* In addition, scholars have discerned a significant relation between 1 Samuel 1–2 and 2

Samuel 22–23 (see 1.1), and some of the connections between 2 Samuel 22 (David's song) and 2 Samuel 6 are also shared with 1 Samuel 2 (Hannah's song, vv. 1-10; Samuel's service, vv. 11-36). The following list assembles the links which the writer has discerned between 2 Samuel 6 and passages in 1 Samuel outside 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2 (and also in 2 Samuel 22).

- The ark and its location. The ארון is central in 1 Samuel 3–7 and 2 Samuel 6 only. It appears elsewhere in 2 Sam. 7.2; 11.11; 15.24-25, 29, and in MT 1 Sam. 14.18. Reference is made to (Saul's) גבעה (twice) in 1 Sam. 7.1; 10.5, 10, 26; 11.4; 13.2-3, 15-16; 14.2, 5, 16; 15.34; 22.6; 23.19; 26.1, 3; 2 Sam. 2.24-25; 5.25; 6.3-4; 21.6; 23.29. ארון and גבעה occur together only in MT 1 Sam. 14.18; 2 Sam. 6.3-4.
- Yahweh's name. שם יהוה צבאות occurs in 1 Sam. 17.45; 2 Sam. 6.2, 18, and elsewhere in the Bible in Isa. 18.7 only.
- Yahweh's presence. יהוה לפני appears in 1 Sam. 1.12, 15, 19; 6.20; 7.6; 10.19, 25; 11.15 (twice); 12.7; 15.33; 21.7 (מלפני), 8; 23.18; 26.19; 2 Sam. 5.3; 6.5, 14, 16-17, 21 (twice); 7.18; 21.9. The theological adverbial rarely occurs in contexts of sacrifice: 1 Sam. 7.6; 11.15; 2 Sam. 6.17.
- Yahweh's abode. אהל is used for the deity's dwelling in 1 Sam. 2.22 (אהל מועד); 2 Sam. 6.17; 7.6.
- Yahweh's 'break out'. The nominal and verbal forms of פָּרַץ (once פָּצַר) occur in 1 Sam. 3.1; 15.23; 25.10; 28.23; 2 Sam. 5.20; 6.8; 13.25, 27. The relation between 2 Samuel 5–6 is also indicated by נשא in 2 Sam. 5.21; 6.3-4, and by the root צעד in 2 Sam. 5.24; 6.13 (cf. 22.37).
- David's 'supporters'. The numbers 3000 and 30,000 occur in 1 Sam. 4.10; 11.8; 13.2, 5; 24.3; 26.2; 2 Sam. 6.1. כל-בית ישראל occurs in 1 Sam. 7.2-3; 2 Sam. 1.12; 6.5, 15; 12.8; 16.3. המון appears in 1 Sam. 4.14; 14.16, 19; 2 Sam. 6.19; 18.29. The accompaniment phrase וכל-העם אשר אתו is used in 1 Sam. 14.20; 2 Sam. 6.20.
- David's dance. The verb שָׁחַק is used in 1 Sam. 18.7; 2 Sam. 2.14; 6.5, 21. Dance in Samuel occurs only in context with David's activities: 1 Sam. 18.6-7; 21.12; 29.5 (dance of Israelite women upon the return of David and Israel after war with the Philistines); 1 Sam. 30.16 (dance of the Amalekites after pillaging Ziklag and prior to their defeat by David and Israel); 2 Sam. 6.5, 14 (?), 16, 21 (dance of David [and the Israelites in 6.5] while transferring the ark).

- 'David's' music. The root **רוע** occurs only in 1 Sam. 4.5 (twice), 6 (twice); 10.24; 17.20, 52; 2 Sam. 6.15. David's musical interest and ability are mentioned in 2 Sam. 1.18-27 (Song of the Bow); 2 Sam. 22.1-51 (Song of Thanksgiving); 2 Sam. 23.1 ('Israel's pleasant/sweet psalmist/singer'). Reference is made to David's activity as musician in 1 Sam. 16.16-18, 23; 18.10; 19.9 (always with **נגן**; **בכנור** ± **ביד** ± **בנגן**), and perhaps (formerly) in 2 Sam. 6.14, 16 (cf. **מכרר**). Samuel's **ברושים** is secondary to Chronicles' **בשרים** in 2 Sam. 6.5 // 1 Chron. 13.9, but it is interesting that the root **שיר** is used in 1 Sam. 18.6; 2 Sam. 19.36; 22.1 in this book.
- David's clothing. **אפור** is used in 1 Sam. 2.18, 28 (the judge-prophet[-priest?] Samuel); 1 Sam. 14.3 ('Saul's' priest Ahijah); 1 Sam. 21.10; 22.18 ('David's' priests Ahimelech and other priests); 1 Sam 23.6, 9; 30.7 (Abiathar); 2 Sam. 6.14 (David). **חגר אפור** occurs in 1 Sam. 2.18; 2 Sam. 6.14. **אפור בד** occurs in 1 Sam. 2.18; 22.18; 2 Sam. 6.14.
- David's anger. A person rarely expresses anger with Yahweh in the Bible, and then it is inevitably reported with the phrase **חרה ל**. Human anger at the deity appears in 1 Sam. 15.11 (Samuel); 2 Sam. 6.8 (David).
- David's fear. **ירא (את) יהוה** occurs in 1 Sam. 12.14, 18, 24; 2 Sam. 6.9.
- David's sacrifice. Saul is associated with sacrifice in 1 Sam. 10.8; 13.9-10, 12; 14.32-34; 15.15, 21-22. The noun **שלם** occurs in 1 Sam. 10.8; 11.15; 13.9; 2 Sam. 6.17, 18; 24.25. The singular **עלה**, in cases where the number of sacrifices is difficult to pinpoint, occurs in 1 Sam. 6.14; 7.9, 10; 13.9, 10, 12; 2 Sam. 6.18; 24.22. The pattern 'singular **עלה** followed by **שלמים** in a chain' occurs in 1 Sam. 13.9; 2 Sam. 6.18. The pattern 'plural **עלות** followed by **שלמים** in a chain' occurs in 2 Sam. 6.17; 24.25. **לפני יהוה** occurs in context with the verbs **העלה** or **הקרב** or the nouns **עלה** or **שלם** in 1 Sam. 11.15; 2 Sam. 6.17.
- David's distribution. **חלק** is used in 1 Sam. 30.24; 2 Sam. 6.19; 19.30. Other stories in Samuel related to the distribution of spoil and gifts are: 1 Sam. 14.24-46 (Saul's rash vow and Jonathan's reprimand that the Israelites should enjoy the spoil of war against the Philistines); 1 Sam. 15.1-34 (Saul's illicit acquirement of the spoil of war against the Amalekites); 1 Sam. 30.1-31 (David's gift [vv. 11-12] to the Egyptian and his lavish distribution [vv. 26-31] of the spoil of war against the Amalekites).
- David's blessing. In Samuel, David blesses (e.g., 2 Sam. 6.18) or is blessed more than any other person, and blessing is wished on several occasions, but Eli alone blesses another, in this case Elkanah and Hannah (1 Sam. 2.20).
- David's honor and shame. The roots **קלל** and **כבד** are closely associated in 1 Sam. 2.8, 29-30; 6.5-6; 2 Sam. 6.20, 22. The root **שפל** is used in 1 Sam. 2.7; 2 Sam. 6.22; 2 Sam. 22.28. See below on David's honor and shame and Michal's hate.

- David's self-exposure. The expression of Yahweh's self-revelation (הנגלה) in 1 Sam. 2.27 and David's self-exposure (נגלה ... כהגלות נגלות) in 2 Sam. 6.20 is beyond coincidence in Samuel and in the Bible.
- David's maid-servants. שפחה and אמה are used 1 Sam. 1.11 (three times), 16, 18; 8.16; 25.24 (twice), 25, 27, 28, 31, 41; 28.21, 22; 2 Sam. 6.20, 22; 2 Sam. 14.6-7, 12, 15-17, 19; 17.17. Male and maid-servants are closely associated in 1 Sam. 25.41 (ותאמר הנה אמתך לשפחה לרחץ רגלי עבדי אדני) and 2 Sam. 6.20 (לעיני אמהות עבדיו).
- David's selection as king. בחר is used for the choice of Saul and David. Yahweh chooses Saul (1 Sam. 10.24; cf. 12.13) and rejects him (1 Sam. 15.23, 26; 16.1). Yahweh chooses David (implied in 1 Sam. 16.11-13; 2 Sam. 6.21) over his brothers (1 Sam. 16.7-10). The verb צוה is used 29 times in Samuel, and then as 'appoint' only for Yahweh's appointment of judges over Israel in 2 Sam. 7.11 and Yahweh's appointment of David as נגיד over Israel in 1 Sam. 13.14 ('over his people'); 25.30 ('over Israel'); 2 Sam. 6.21 ('over Yahweh's people, over Israel'). נגיד appears in 1 Sam. 9.16; 10.1; 13.14; 25.30; 2 Sam. 5.2; 6.21; 7.8. ברוך יהוה (restored?) occurs in 1 Sam. 25.32, 39; 2 Sam. 18.28.
- David's strength. The root עז is used in 1 Sam. 2.10; 2 Sam. 6.14; 22.18 (cf. עזא in 2 Sam. 6.3-4, 7-8).
- Michal. Saul's daughter is a character in 1 Sam. 14.49-51; 18.12-29; 19.8-18; 25.43-44; 2 Sam. 3.12-16; 6.12-23; 21.7-9.
- Michal's window. חלון occurs in 1 Sam. 19.12; 2 Sam. 6.16.
- Michal's hate. The verb בזה is used in 1 Sam. 2.30; 10.27; 17.42; 2 Sam. 6.16; 12.9, 10. כבד and קלל and בזה are used together in 1 Sam. 2.30; 2 Sam. 6.16, 22.
- Michal's childlessness. Compare Hannah's barrenness in 1 Sam. 1.2, 5-6; 2.5, with Michal's childlessness in 2 Sam. 6.23.
- Michal's death. מות עד יום מות appears in 1 Sam. 15.35; 2 Sam. 6.23; 20.3 (מות is the infinitive construct in the latter).
- David's and Michal's confrontation. The confrontation in 2 Samuel 6 has a number of similarities with Samuel's and Saul's confrontation in 1 Samuel 13. See 1 Sam. 13.9-10, 12 and 2 Sam. 6.17-18, 20 in 'David's sacrifice' above. In particular, the phrase 'finish offering' (מ/להעלות + כלה) occurs in the Bible only in 1 Sam. 13.10; 2 Sam. 6.18. The lexemes ברך (1 Sam. 13.10; 2 Sam. 6.18, 20) and לקראת (1 Sam. 13.10; 2 Sam. 6.20) can be added to the similarities. See 5.1.3.5.

- Lastly, it is interesting that מעיל is absent in 2 Sam. 6.14 but is used in 1 Chron. 15.27, as in 1 Sam. 2.19, and ככר לחם is absent in 2 Sam. 6.19 but is used in 1 Chron. 16.3, as in 1 Sam. 2.36.

The issues of text, language (grammar, vocabulary, style) and story are interconnected. In general, text-criticism is the most dependable means for discerning editorial developments in biblical compositions. The writer has utilised the textual-exegetical method to elucidate earlier and later stages in the editorial histories of Samuel's and Chronicles' stories of David's transfer of the ark. 2 Samuel 6 shows greater textual variation and fluidity, more doublets, and more interpretative difficulties than does 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16. This thesis shows that many readings in 2 Samuel 6 special to MT are interconnected and associated with three intertwined themes.

1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 has one short and two lengthy pluses (13.1-4, 15.1-24, 16.4-42) but the text and story in its synoptic material are more primitive than in synoptic Samuel. 2 Samuel 6 has one short plus (vv. 20b-23) but the text and story in its synoptic material have developed in MT Samuel beyond LXX Samuel and beyond synoptic Chronicles. In other words, MT 2 Samuel 6 is a shorter yet also later version of the story of David's transfer of the ark. To clarify, Chronicles' ark story is supplemented more than Samuel's in quantity of material. Its story is longer. Samuel's ark story is shorter, having only the supplemental Michal material, but this story has developed over a longer period of time. Chronicles' story stopped developing while Samuel's continued 'rolling', for the reasons discussed in 2.3.2.1. These contrasting facts, that is, Samuel's shortness but late wording, and Chronicles' lengthiness but primitive wording, are the reasons for many misjudgements of Chronicles vis-à-vis Samuel(–Kings). Scholars observe the lengthy supplements to Chronicles and they take for granted that Chronicles' terminology is also the result of changes made in this book. To the contrary, a critical examination of the terminology in MT 2 Samuel 6 and MT 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16 indicates that Samuel's

wording is routinely derivative. The story of David's transfer of the ark was edited very differently in (MT) Samuel and Chronicles: (later) word-linkage vs. (earlier) supplements, respectively. The 'poor condition' of the text of MT 2 Samuel 6 is evidence of its editorial history.⁸⁹¹ Specifically, the text reflects much late literary creativity and ideological bias. Its variant readings relate to an apology of Davidic kingship, an apology of Davidic and Yahwistic character, and cultic practice. In addition, many textual manipulations in MT 2 Samuel 6 connect with the language of stories in 1 Samuel, especially chapters 2, 10-15, 17 and 25. All these interconnected adjustments point to successive editorial interventions over a substantial period of time and their cumulative appearance and objective may be labelled a literary layer. Consequently, this writer concurs with Ulrich and Nysse regarding the text of MT 2 Samuel 6 (see 1.3.2). However, the present investigation moves beyond their *text-critical* investigations by supplying an explanation for the readings in MT 2 Samuel 6 on the basis of a *textual-exegetical* analysis.

Most accept as true that Chronicles is based on Samuel-Kings in their near-canonical stage of development. Auld argues, however, (1) that Samuel-Kings and Chronicles are revisions by supplementation of a common inherited text and (2) that the stories in 1 Samuel 1–30 were written as a preface to the shared stories in 1 Samuel 31–2 Samuel 24. What are the implications of the present investigation for Auld's theories? First, this thesis does not directly argue for or against either view—the conventional one or Auld's. Second, the results of this thesis suggest that Auld should not base his arguments on the relatively shorter variations between the MT and other texts of Samuel. Most MT 2 Samuel 6 readings post-date readings in LXX Samuel, 4QSam^a and synoptic Chronicles. In short, Auld cannot argue his theories primarily on a textual-exegetical basis since the extant versional evidence is too far removed from the large-scale authorial

⁸⁹¹ 'MT's angularities are probably not mistakes, but evidences of the text's use' (Walters 1993: 290).

procedures which his theories envision. The text-critical evidence suggests, for example, that MT 1 Sam. 2.1-10 and 17.1-58 are relatively later versions of the song of Hannah and the story of David and Goliath, but the textual witnesses cannot be used to show that all of 1 Samuel 1–30 is a supplement to the shared stories in 1 Samuel 31–2 Samuel 24. In addition, Auld must be cautious about building authorial proposals about the non-synoptic Saul stories based on linguistic links between these stories and the synoptic David stories since in the case of the latter the MT may have been influenced in the reverse direction. In other words, for example, revisers adjusted the words in synoptic MT 2 Samuel 6 so as to create word-links with (MT) 1 Samuel 10–15. Consequently, these linkages cannot show that David's ark story prompted the creation of stories about Saul which share similar terminology. Third, the foregoing cautions do not eliminate the possibility that Auld's theories are in fact correct. To the contrary, this writer suggests on several occasions that 1 Sam. 4.1b-7.2 was written as a preface to 2 Samuel 6, but this contention has a literary rather than a text-critical basis.⁸⁹² Furthermore, it is remarkable that many modifications in MT 2 Samuel 6 link to the non-synoptic stories of Saul and the non-synoptic book-ends of Samuel. These late adjustments in MT 2 Samuel 6 may signal the momentum of the earlier supplements to David's story which Samuel and Chronicles share. Finally, the writer suggests that the epilogue in 2 Sam. 6.20b-23 was absent from the Chronicler's *Vorlage* and that this supplement may coincide with the composition of earlier stories involving Michal in 1 Samuel. Much work remains to be done on the unfolding of sources and revisions in the stories about David in Samuel and Chronicles.

⁸⁹² See, e.g., 1.2.2.